DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 392 285 FL 023 637

AUTHOR	Heltoft, Lars; Jakobsen, Lisbeth Falster
TITLE	Danish Passives and Subject Positions as a Mood System--A Content Analysis; and Paradigmatic Structure, Word Order and Grammaticalization. ROLIG-Papir 54.
INSTITUTION	Roskilde Univ. Center (Denmark).
REPORT NO	ISSN-0106-0821
PUB DATE	Dec 95
NOTE	87p.
AVAILABLE FROM	ROLIG, hus 03.2.4, Roskilde University Center, Postbox 260, DK-4000 Roskilde, Denmark; E-mail: rolig@babel.ruc.dk.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Danish; Diachronic Linguistics; Foreign Countries; *Grammar; *Language Patterns; Language Research; Linguistic Theory; *Morphology (Languages); Syntax; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS	*Passives; *Word Order

ABSTRACT

Two papers on linguistic theory are presented. The first examines the relationship between two subsystems of Danish grammar: (1) the morphology and meaning of the two passives (a morphological passive and a periphrastic passive); and (2) the word order rules and meanings attached to indefinite subjects, irrespective of voice. It is claimed that despite traditional analyses and views, these two subsystems are intimately related in their content structures. Some implications for other Scandinavian languages are also found. The second paper suggests the need for refining the concept of paradigmatic structure in functionally-oriented linguistics, with the addition of paradigms. The history of the mediopassive structure is examined to illustrate the structure-boundness of grammaticalization processes and the dynamic character of any synchronic state of a language. A structural, content-based view of grammaticality and of grammaticalization processes is proposed, with the inclusion of semantically significant word order phenomena into grammar. Each paper contains references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ISSN 0106-0821

ED 392 285

ROLIG papir

Lars Heltoft og
Lisbeth Falster
Jakobsen

Danish Passives and Subject Positions as a Mood System - a Content Analysis

Lars Heltoft

Paradigmatic Structure, Word Order and Grammaticalization

54 95

Roskilde UniversitetsCenter
Lingvistgruppen

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Hartmut Haberland
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

FL023637

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ISSN 0106-0821

ROLIG-papir 54
Roskilde Universitetscenter
Lingvistgruppen

Lars Heltoft og Lisbeth Falster Jakobsen
Danish Passives and Subject Positions as a Mood System – a Content Analysis

Lars Heltoft
Paradigmatic Structure, Word Order and Grammaticalization

ROLIG-papir is a series of working papers written by members of ROLIG, the linguistic circle of Roskilde University Center, and others. Readers are invited to comment on or criticize the papers. For ordering information, see the back of this page.

Roskilde Universitetscenter
December 1995

ROLIG papers are distributed free of charge to any private person or institution on our mailing list. Write to: ROLIG, hus 03.2.4, Roskilde University Center, P.O.Box 260, DK-4000 Roskilde, Denmark
e-mail: rolig@babel.ruc.dk
FAX: (+45) 46 75 44 10
In the USA, some ROLIG-papers are available on microfiche/paper from the ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, c/o CAL, 1118 22nd Stret, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20067

ROLIG-papirerne bliver sendt gratis til alle der står i vores adressekartotek.
ROLIGs adresse er: ROLIG, hus 03.2.4, RUC, Postbox 260, 4000 Roskilde
elektronisk post: rolig@babel.ruc.dk
FAX: 46 75 44 10

Danish Passives and Subject Positions as a Mood System - a Content Analysis

Lars Heltoft and Lisbeth Falster Jakobsen
Universities of Roskilde and Copenhagen

1. Introduction

The present article[1] deals with two subsystems of Danish grammar that from the outset might seem to be unrelated, namely the morphology and meaning of the two passives in Danish, and the word order rules and the meanings attached to indefinite subjects (irrespective of voice). We shall claim that in spite of all traditional analyses and views these two subsystems are intimately related as far as their content structures are concerned. We shall confine ourselves to Danish, but we are confident that the results will form a fruitful point of departure for descriptions of the differences between Danish, Swedish and the Norwegian languages.

The two passives

The modern so-called mainland Scandinavian languages have two passives, a morphological passive in *-s*, and a periphrastic passive consisting of an auxiliary + past participle. Both are passives, in that they demote the subject of the active construction and allow promotion of an object to subject status.

(1)	a.	*I de år*	hærgedes		*havene*	*nemlig*
		In those years	ravage-PAST	S-PASS	the seas	for

af algierske sørøvere
by Algierian pirates
'For in those years the seas were ravaged by Algierian pirates'

b. *Jylland* blev hærget
Jutland become-PAST ravage-PAST PTC

af svenske tropper
by Swedish troops
'Jutland was ravaged by Swedish troops'

We shall analyse this content distinction in detail and claim that what is actually involved can be best described as a mood distinction[2]. However, there is no similar distinction in the active voice, and we are left with the somewhat unusual picture of a language that has a mood distinction in the passive voice, but not in the active. Once this content distinction has been established, however, it is a legitimate strategy to ask whether there might be other expression systems involved in doing the job of the passives in the active voice. Somewhat unexpectedly, we find this alternative system in the word order rules for indefinite subjects.

Indefinite subjects

Danish has a 'there' construction that treats content subjects as positional objects, inserting *der* 'there' in subject position, e.g.:

(2) *der* *var faldet* en sten *ned fra taget*
there was fallen a tile down from the roof
'a tile had fallen down from the roof'

This construction is particularly productive and frequent with indefinite subjects and has normally been regarded as an option for introducing subjects as discourse referents. In many cases, however, new indefinite subjects occur in normal subject positions, e.g.:

(3) en sten *var faldet* *ned fra taget*
a tile was fallen down from the roof
'a tile had fallen down from the roof'

Such clauses are not free variants, although the contrast is probably hard to evoke for non-native speakers. Provisionally, (2) is a description of a factual situation, whereas (3) is a kind of narrated scenario; many native speakers would identify (3) as fiction. We shall claim that the opposition between (2) and (3) concerns the very same content features that are involved in the passive distinction, and we shall follow this idea in detail to determine how far the parallel extends. We shall claim that at the content level the systems are identical.

The outcome of this analysis will call for new conceptual tools. The classical notion of a paradigm will not suffice, since the options involved do not have the same syntagmatic distribution although they must be allowed to coexist (in systematic ways). To account for such situations, we shall need the notion of a content-based paradigm, as distinct from normal, expression-based paradigms; compare Heltoft (this volume), where these notions are discussed in relation to grammaticalization.

The content distinction in question lies within the same domain as the distinction in Dikian Functional Grammar betweem subjective and objective (propositional) mood (Hengeveld 1987, Dik 1989, Nuyts 1992). It cannot, however, be reduced to any purportedly universal content features, but remains an instance of specifically Danish content structure (or 'content form', the term preferred in our tradition). Our point is precisely that this distinction is highly language-specific and that it could not have been uncovered without careful scrutiny of the Danish language system by means of the 'commutation test' (Hjelmslev 1943; Harder, this volume; Falster Jakobsen, this volume). At this point our stance would seem to be at variance with the cognitive trend in much of international functionally oriented linguistics, and we shall therefore try to clarify it through a brief discussion of the relation between the positional rules for Danish subjects and iconically conceived message structure. We do not deny the relevance of the study of universal, cognitively based meaning; but this is to be understood as "content substance" and is not identical to linguistic meaning, in the sense of language-specific content. What we do insist on is a level of linguistic semantics organized in highly language-specific patterns; it is in this sense that our article is an analysis of content structure.

2. Mood in Danish

The distinction between the two Danish passives has remained a puzzle to grammarians and linguists seeking its content along the parameters of voice, e.g. in semantic shades of agenthood (Rehling 1934), or of Aktionsart (Mikkelsen 1911, Juul and Skadhauge 1995). Aktionsart is certainly involved, but only secondarily. We shall claim that this distinction is much better understood when analyzed as a distinction of mood within the passive system. Both are passives, but as far as the difference between them is concerned we shall speak of the (inflectional) *s*-mood vs. the periphrastic mood. Thus, the outcome is a set of portmanteau morphemes. The morphology of the opposition is shown in fig. 1.

Fig. 1. The Danish morphological passive system: periphrastic and inflectional passive, present and past tense

periphrastic passive	s-passive (inflectional)
bliver/er + PAST PTC	-(e)s
blev/var + PAST PTC	-ede/-te -s

The *s*-passive morpheme is constantly *-s*, the schwa in *-(e)s* being morphophonemically determined. The morphemes *-ede/-te* are variants of the past morpheme. An example is:

(4) a.

bliver	hørt	hør-es
become-PRES	hør-PAST PTC	hør-S-PASS
'is heard'		'is heard'

b.	blev	hør-t	hør-te-s
	become-PAST	hear-PAST PTC	hear-PAST S-PASS
	'was heard'		'was heard'

periphrastic passive	s-passive
bliver/er + hør-t	hør-es
blev/var + hør-t	hør-te-s

2.1 Content Analysis: applying the commutation test

Our focus of interest is not expression structure, however, but content structure, or content form, as we shall call it. Content form is the set of coding instructions attached to these morphemes, delimited in principle via their position in the global semiotic system of Danish and in practice accessible through systematic applications of the commutation test. A first approximation may run as follows:

(5)	a.	tales	*der*	*dansk i Skåne?*
		speak-PRES S-MOOD	there	Danish in Scania?
		'is Danish spoken in Scania?		

	b.	bliver	der	talt	*dansk i Skåne?*
		become-PRES	there	speak-PAST PTC	Danish in Scania?
		'is Danish spoken in Scania?			

(6) a. *der* tales *ikke mere dansk i Skåne*
there speak-PRES S-MOOD no more Danish in Scania
'Danish is no longer spoken in Scania'

b. *der* bliver *ofte* talt
there become-PRES often speak-PAST PTC

dansk i Skåne
Danish in Scania
'Danish is very often spoken in Scania'

(7) a. *indledningen* skrives *til sidst*
the introduction write-PRES S-MOOD last
'the introduction is to be written last'

b. *indledningen* bliver skrevet *til sidst*
the introduction become-PRES write-PAST PTC last
'the introduction will be written last'

(5a) and (6a) (with the *s*-morpheme) indicate what is generally the case according to a norm, as opposed to (5b) and (6b) which are simple constative utterances denoting actual events. (5a and b) ask different questions and (6a and b) are not mutually inconsistent, since individual Danes talking Danish in Scania does not preclude the fact that Danish is no longer the language generally spoken there. In (7a) the *s*-morpheme indicates a decision that need not be the speaker's, or a norm (the ambiguity of the English translation is also in the Danish), whereas (7b) is the speaker's prediction and nobody else's.

The *s*-mood can indicate general statements and norms, but as (7a) shows, it can also indicate that non-speaker consciousness or intention is involved in the propositional content described. In (7a) the speaker presents the content as somebody else´s decision or intention. Since this is the interpretation of the *s*-mood that has been overlooked both

by Danish tradition and in the sparse treatments in the international literature (Hopper and Traugott 1993, Kemmer 1993), we shall document it at some length. (8) is a particularly instructive example:

(8) a. NYE FORHANDLINGER
Parterne i slagterikonflikten blev i går enige om at gøre et nyt forhandlingsforsøg i dag. Strejken, der nu har varet en måned,

afblæses *dog ikke af den grund,*
call off-PRES S-MOOD however not for that reason
'is not to be called off because of this'

og det er stadig spørgsmålet om arbejdstid, der skiller parterne.
(Berl.T. 030593:I,1)

'RENEWED NEGOTIATIONS
The parties in the slaughterhouse conflict agreed yesterday to try one more round of negations today. The strike, which now has lasted for a month, is not to be called off because of this, and it is still the issue of working hours that divides the parties'

b. *Strejken(..)* bliver *dog ikke*
the strike(..) become-PRES however not

afblæst *af den grund*
call off-PAST PTC for that reason
'the strike will not be called off because of this'

In (8a) the *s*-mood marks intentional coherence with the preceding clause. The conflicting parties have agreed to meet again to resume negotiations. The *s*-mood *af-*

blæses 'is called off' marks the sentence as the decision or intention of the negotiating parties, not necessarily as the speaker's. By contrast, (8b) is plainly the judgment and responsibility of the speaker. The *s*-mood inserts, so to speak, a layer of non-speaker consciousness with propositional scope.

In (9) the consciousness responsible for the instruction quoted in the subordinate *at-* 'that' clause is represented in the main clause, and the function of the *s*-mood in this case is very close to the use of subjunctive *be* in academic varieties of English.

(9) Øvelse: Forsvarets Markskadekontor på Ringsted Kaserne har over for deltagerne i NATO-øvelsen i Syd- og Vestsjælland indskærpet

at	*der*	tages	*hensyn*
that	there	take-PRES S-MOOD	due regard

til landmændenes marker (Berl.T. 160993:2)
to farmers' fields
'that due regard be taken to farmers' fields'

'Maneuvre: The Defence Office for Field Damage at Ringsted Barracks has impressed on the participants in the NATO-maneuvre in Southern and Western Zealand that due regard be taken to farmers' fields'.

But as examples (5-8) have already shown, the Danish *s*-mood is not a dependent mood, and it covers a larger variety of senses. (8-9) show the function of the *s*-mood as what we shall call propositionally located consciousness or intention (intention in the sense of 'aim, purpose, meaning'). This intention is propositionally located coded meaning; it is not to be confused with the 'communicative intention' of the speech act performed by the speaker in a given utterance. Several further examples of this reading are given in the following paragraphs.

By contrast, most declarative sentences with periphrastic passives simply count as plain assertions with no non-speaker consciousness involved; the only consciousness

involved is the speaker's own. Since they are at the same time bound up with Aktionsart because of the semantics of the auxiliary contrast *blive* 'become,turn' vs. *være* 'be', they classify something as an event with a spatiotemporal dynamic contour. We shall discuss the relations of the passives to Aktionsart below.

The *s*-mood of propositionally located consciousness is further generalized to encompass inserted narrators. (10) is a matter of 'reported consciousness' in this sense.

(10) DINOSAUREN SOM KRITISK INTELLEKTUEL

(..) Plottet <i Spielbergs film Jurassic Park> er måske bekendt: en ældgammel rigmand planlægger en forlystelsespark af hidtil ukendte dimensioner og budget på en ø ud for Costa Rica.

Den	befolkes	*af genetisk genopvakte*
It	populate-PRES S-MOOD	by genetically revived
dinosaurer (..)		
dinosaurs. (..)		

'It is populated by genetically revived dinosaurs'

(..) Øgler fra vidt forskellige tidsaldre befolker så forskellige indhegninger på øen, der er ved at blive gjort klar til åbning, da et hold af palæontologer med flere sammen med milliardærens egne børnebørn

indbyd*es*	til en rundtur (..)
invite-PRES S-MOOD	on a round trip

'are invited on a round trip(..)'

<H>elt fra starten ved vi fra to små sidehistorier at det vil gå galt:

en skambidt arbejder fra øen, der flyves til fastlandet,
a mutilated worker from the island who fly-PRES S-MOOD to the mainland
'a mutilated worker who is flown to the mainland'

hvor små rovøgler, flygtet fra øen, allerede gnaver sig ind på spædbørn langs kysten.. (Inf. 15.09.1993:10)

(Full English translation:

THE DINOSAUR AS A CRITICAL INTELLECTUAL

The plot <of Spielberg's film Jurassic Park> is possibly well-known. An exceedingly old billionaire is planning a pleasure park of hitherto unknown dimensions and budgets on an island off Costa Rica. It is populated (populate-PRES S-MOOD) by genetically revived dinosaurs.(..)

So lizards from various ages inhabit various enclosures on the island, which is being made ready for opening, when a team of paleontologists - together with several of the billionaire's own grandchildren - are invited (invite-PRES S-MOOD) on a round trip (..)

From the very beginning we know from two minor side anecdotes that things will go wrong: a mutilated worker from the island who is flown (fly-PRES S-MOOD) to the mainland where small predator dinosaurs, escaped from the island, are already gnawing at babies along the coast..'

(10) is from a summary of a film plot (Spielberg's Jurassic Park). The *s*-mood forms *befolkes, indbydes*, and *flyves* mark the text as a story told by others. (This holds indisputably for *indbydes* and *flyves*, which denote single occurrences in the plot, whereas *befolkes* could be taken to denote the normal state of affairs).

This function of the *s*-mood to mark narrated or even imaginary worlds or scenarios (the latter term suggested to us by Peter Harder) is as far as the semantic generalization involved here will take us. We are no longer speaking of a mind planning

or intending something, but only of the content as rendered by some narrator (and this narrator, of course, can be a textual narrator (Booth 1961), not necessarily one existing in the real world).

2.2 The past of the s-mood

Space will not allow us to deal in detail with the past tense of the *s*-mood, although we shall return briefly to it in 2.5. A number of intricate problems with the past *s*-mood of the strong verbs (the majority of which probably never formed an *s*-mood) call for separate treatment. Hansen and Heltoft (in prep.) will offer an account of this, compatible with the present analysis of the passives as a mood system within the passive voice. We shall insist, however, that where the weak verbs (and one of the strong classes) are concerned, the past is fully alive as a structural option. In (11) it is used to describe norms in the past, namely the rules for ordeal by fire.

(11) (..) *den anklagede skulle tage et stykke glødende jern og bære det ni skridt (..). Bagefter blev han iført en vante,*

som	forseglede	*og først*	aftoges
that	seal-PAST S-MOOD	and not until	take off-PAST S-MOOD

efter nogle dages forløb (Skalk 1994,4:28)
a few days after
'that was sealed and not taken off until some days after'

'The accused was to take a piece of red-hot iron and carry it nine steps (..). Afterwards a glove was put on, which was sealed and not taken off until some days after'

The past *s*-mood is also the way to mark a text as the minutes of a meeting, marking the

text as the decision of others rather than of the person writing.

(12) *Alle pengene* uddeltes *og adskillige*
All the money award-PAST S-MOOD and several
'All the money was awarded and several

medarbejdere oprykkedes *i andre lønklasser.*
employees promote-PAST S-MOOD to other salary grades.
employees were promoted to other salary grades. (..)

Mødet afsluttedes *kl. 18.30.*
The meeting terminate-PAST S-MOOD at 18.30.
The meeting was terminated at 18.30.'

The undoubtedly low frequency of the past of the *s*-passive and its confinement to written styles and genres calls for a discussion of markedness, for which see 2.5.

2.3 The two passives as a distinction between subjective and objective mood

Mood has to do with subjectivity (or its opposite: non-subjectivity or objectivity). Subjectivity, the fingerprint of the speaker on the utterance, is used in the sense it has in Benveniste (1958) and Lyons (1977, 1982). Mood distinctions indicate various ways in which the speaker can show his attitude or position with respect to the propositional content of the utterance. Meillet (1964:224-226) stands as our representative of the traditional view of mood in the Indo-European tradition. For Meillet, as far as the classical languages are concerned, mood covers the distinctions between what is positively affirmed or denied, what is expected, and what is possible or impossible (counterfactual). Similarly, Lyons (1968) characterizes modality (his term for the content substance field of mood) along three dimensions: wish and intention, necessity and obligation, certainty and possibility. Our analysis of the content opposition between the

two passives in Danish is a language-specific variety of mood in the general sense above. The function of the periphrastic passive is not to manifest the assertive speech-act frame of declarative sentences, but to emphasize that only the speaker's perspective is involved.

The *s*-passive, by contrast, indicates the presence of another consciousness or intention located in the propositional layer. Again, there is no contrast here between the *s*-passive and a declarative speech act frame. The *s*-passive has two subgroups: generic/normative readings and particular/non-generic readings. It marks a relation of distance between speaker and propositional content. Where generic and normative sentences are concerned, the relevant point-of-view is not solely with the speaker. Norms are norms by virtue of their being observed also by others. In a similar way, particular readings insert an agent/narrator so to speak between the speaker and the propositional content. The factuality of the clause is in part dependent on this propositionally located consciousness or intention. The closest analogy seems to be the point-of-view of narrative theory. In fact, we shall formulate the general opposition between the two moods in terms of point-of-view. Either the speaker's consciousness (with the periphrastic passive) is the only relevant point-of-view, or (with the *s*-passive) another point-of-view is inserted: the general narrator behind generic sentences and norms, or a particular point-of-view, a narrated person or a narrator. In this sense, we shall speak of subjectively anchored clauses vs. objectively (non-subjectively) anchored clauses. The periphrastic mood is the subjective mood (anchored solely in the speaker), the *s*-passive an objective, propositionally anchored mood.

To use the concept 'modal factor' from the Danish structuralist Gunnar Bech's description of modal verbs in German: the periphrastic mood has a subjective modal factor, the *s*-mood has an objective modal factor (cf. Bech 1952).

2.4 Modal verbs and passive mood

Strikingly, subjective (epistemic and volitional) readings of the modal verbs select the periphrastic mood of the infinitive, while non-subjective (deontic and causal) readings take a *s*-mood infinitive. This distribution is well known - and in fact it strongly hints that mood is involved.

(13) a. (epistemic)

kaninerne	kan	blive	spist	*af ræven*
the rabbits	can	become-INF	eat-PAST PTC	by the fox

'the rabbits may be eaten by the fox'

b. (non-epistemic)

spidsmus	kan	*ikke*	spises
shrews	can	not	eat-INF S-MOOD

'shrews cannot be eaten (i.e. are inedible)'

(14) a. (epistemic)

disse roser	må *snart*	blive	beskåret
these roses	must soon	become-INF	prune-PAST PTC

'these roses will be pruned soon'

b. (non-epistemic)

disse roser	må	*snart*	beskæres
these roses	must	soon	prune-INF S-MOOD

'these roses must be pruned soon'

(15) a.(subjective wish)

den lille sorte høne	må	*ikke*	blive	spist
the little black hen	may	not	become-INF	eat-PAST PTC

'may the little black hen not be eaten'

b. (negated non-subjective permission = non-subjective instruction)

den lille sorte høne	må	*ikke*	spises
the little black hen	must	not	eat-INF S-MOOD

'the little black hen must not be eaten'

(16) a. (promise: subjective guarantee)

denne postej	skal	blive	spist
this paté	shall	become-INF	eat-PAST PTC

inden ugens udgang
before the week end
'this paté will be eaten before the week end'

b. (instruction)

denne postej	skal	spises	*inden ugens udgang*
this paté	must	eat-INF S-MOOD	before the week end

'this paté is to be eaten before the week end'

Whatever the voice distinction and aspectual distinction that have been suggested to account for the distinction between the passives (Mikkelsen 1911, Rehling 1934, Juul and Skadhauge ms.), under these interpretations the relationship between modal verbs and the passives remains a semantic riddle. The present analysis is straightforward and simple: lexically, the core system of Danish modal verbs consists of the following four modal verbs (note the homonymy in the case of *måtte* between a possibility reading and a necessity reading):

kunne(inf.)/*kan*(pres.)'can/may' (causal/epistemic possibility)
måtte (inf.)/*må* (pres.)'may' (permission/wish)
måtte (inf.)/*må* (pres.)'must' (causal/epistemic necessity)
skulle (inf.)/*skal* (pres.)'must/shall' (obligation/promise)

This lexical system is neutral with respect to the bracketed readings.

The function of the passives in relation to this system is to narrow down the content of the modals. All readings with the periphrastic mood of the infinitive are speaker-bound, while - to put it crudely - the *s*-mood produces unmarked examples. Again, we take this opposition to be one of subjective anchoring vs. objective anchoring, the periphrastic form being the marked term, the *s*-mood the unmarked one. Without committing ourselves to his framework, we would say in Langacker's terms (Langacker 1985, 1990) that all readings with the periphrastic mood of the passive infinitive are unequivocally grounded already as an effect of the periphrastic mood whereas readings with the *s*-mood have no such effect. Notice in particular, that the unmarkedness of the deontic readings means that they are unmarked with respect to the difference between performative readings (ordering/allowing) and non-performative readings (obligation/-permission).

(17) *den lille sorte høne må gerne spises*
'I hereby permit you: the little black hen may be eaten all right' or 'it is permitted to eat the little black hen'

(18) *den lille sorte høne skal spises*
'see to it that the little black hen is eaten' or ' the norm or plan is to eat the little black hen'

2.5 Markedness

Having stated the opposition above in terms of markedness, we must clarify the sense of this concept in context. We distinguish between two concepts of markedness, depending on the context defining it. The markedness of the passives turn out differently, depending on the concept of markedness applied.

Structural markedness

At the level of the code (la langue), the Danish passives show a general pattern of mutually exclusive terms, the default version of markedness. We think of markedness in the Hjelmslevian vein: the marked option insists on sense A, the non-marked option is non-A. In one interpretation of this there is a sharp division of labour between marked and unmarked forms, in Hjelmslevian terms between a +category and a -category (Hjelmslev 1935:100). The marked option insists on A, but the unmarked option cannot be A. We speak of the unmarked term in this sense as the default term. The periphrastic passive insists on subjective anchoring, the *s*-passive does not reject this, but adds non-subjective (objective) anchoring as well[3].

Markedness in language use

The structural concept of markedness is different from contextually defined, statistical markedness. Since this difference is not always observed, we shall resume our discussion of the past *s*-mood here in this light.

We have not touched upon all the problems connected with the past of the *s*-mood, for the reasons stated in 2.2. Especially relevant in the present context is the low token frequency of the past. We have asserted that the *s*-mood should be considered the unmarked term. This would not be in accordance with statistically based views of markedness. We shall restrict ourselves to considering briefly Givón's view (1990:945f.). In Givón's exposition markedness involves, not unexpectedly, structural complexity, frequency distribution, and cognitive complexity, 'structural' referring to the level of syntactic expression, frequency to discourse modes, and cognitive complexity to accessibility (easy vs. difficult to process)[4].

In our view, frequency belongs to textual markedness, a completely different concept of markedness, at the level of language use. Some text types have subjective anchoring as a constitutive feature, while other text types (accounts, rule texts, etc.) call for objective anchoring. In this sense markedness varies over text types, and some text types may give the impression that the periphrastic mood is the unmarked structural

form. In historical narrative, the generic and normative reading of the *s*-mood can be replaced by the periphrastic mood:

(19) *<Ikke mindst den indbringende trekantshandel spillede en stor rolle.>*
Not least the prosperous triangular trade played a major role.

Fra London	fragtedes			*varer til Afrikas*
From London	transport-PAST S-MOOD			goods to Africa's

vestkyst,	*hvor*	*de*	blev	byttet
west coast	where	they	become-PAST	exchange-PAST PTC

med fangne afrikanere, der som slaver	blev
for captive Africans who as slaves	become-PAST

sejlet	*til Amerika.*
sail-PAST PTC	to America

We would claim that there is no mystery in this. The periphrastic readings are not in themselves synonymous with the *s*-mood. Preference for them may reflect attempted journalistic style. More importantly, in historical narrative the *s*-mood need only be signalled once, and the general readings of the periphrastic mood in (19) are brought about by the context, here especially by the preceding *s*-mood. The example gives the modal key to the text (*fragtedes*): what follows is to be taken as a description of what generally took place. The effect of changing afterwards to the periphrastic mood is also discernible, since this mood in declarative sentences would normally produce descriptions of single, actual events directly, and hence in the general reading it codes repetitions of actual events.

The constitutive rules for text types lead to highly differentiated rules for the use

of systematic oppositions such as the passives in actual text types. Status as marked or unmarked in a text type is determined by the rules of that particular genre and hence by the communicative needs behind it. Therefore, systematically unmarked forms can be textually marked and vice versa.

This does not imply, of course, that there are no interesting relations between these two concepts of markedness. In the present context the relatively higher frequency of the periphrastic mood may very well be the basis of a future generalisation process making the past *s*-mood obsolete.

2.6 Why Aktionsart is only secondarily involved

As hinted at in various places in this text, it is commonly held that Aktionsart is the semantic field involved in this distinction, the *s*-passive being a static, or non-dynamic form, the periphrastic form being the dynamic passive. It is true that the periphrastic mood is specified for a dynamic vs. resultative/static option, by virtue of its being formed by means of Danish copular morphology (Hansen 1966, Heltoft 1995, Harder, Heltoft, and Nedergaard-Thomsen, this volume). The dynamic option of the periphrastic mood is shown in (20a), the resultative/static option in (20b):

(20) a. *Han* bliver *bestemt* udnævnt
He become-PRES surely appoint-PAST PTC

til forsvarsminister
to minister of defence
'Surely, he will be appointed minister of defence'

b. *Han* er *bestemt* udnævnt
He is-PRES surely appoint-PAST PTC

til forsvarsminister
minister of defence
'Surely, he has been appointed minister of defence'

The 'auxiliaries' *være/blive* are identical with the copulas found in subject complement constructions. The *s*-passive knows of no such distinction, but is unspecified for or even outside the category of Aktionsart. Therefore a pair of verbs, which differ only with respect to the features +/- dynamic, such as *have* 'have' (inherently static) and *få* 'get'- (inherently dynamic), both combine with the *s*-passive:

(21) *Kolonialvarer* haves *året rundt,*
Groceries have-PRES S-MOOD the year round,

fisk fås *kun* *om sommeren*
fish get-PRES S-MOOD only in the summer
'Groceries are stocked all year round, fish is obtainable only in summer'

whereas the periphrastic forms, which would intersect with the Aktionsart system by means of *blive/være*, are as impossible as in other Germanic languages. In Dikian terms, we could support an analysis of the *s*-form as unspecified for Aktionsart and of the periphrastic forms as belonging to the extended predication[5].

Although generic and normative readings could readily be conceived of as a subtype of states, our central point remains that in many cases Aktionsart is simply not relevant. Pairs such as (7a and b), repeated here for convenience, have nothing to do with Aktionsart. Both readings indicate an action of writing that may be completed in the future, but (7a) is objectively anchored, (7b) subjectively anchored:

(7) a. *indledningen* skrives *til sidst*
the introduction writ-PRES S-MOOD last
'the introduction is to be written last'

b. *indledningen* bliver skrevet *til sidst*
the introduction become-PRES writ-PAST PTC last
'the introduction will be written last'

If the *s*-passive were sensitive to distinctions of Aktionsart, we would not expect it to be formed freely with all verb classes. If it were inherently static, or non-transitional, it ought not to be formed with verbs of transition (action verbs) denoting simple instances of change, but neither stative nor process nor iterative interpretations are relevant to the contrast in (22a and b). The headline (22a) does not mean that the theatre is in the process of being closed, but that there is a decision or intention[6] to close it:

(22) a. *FIOLTEATRET* LUKKES
the Fiol Theatre close-PRES S-MOOD
'the Fiol Theatre is to be closed'
(Inf. 05.09.1994:1; headline)

b. *FIOLTEATRET* BLIVER LUKKET
the Fiol Theatre become-PRES close-PAST PTC
'the Fiol Theatre will be closed'

Nor would we expect both passives to occur freely in the major syntactic expression system for Aktionsart in Danish, namely detransitivization (object demotion) as described in Durst-Andersen and Herslund (this volume). But in fact both passives can undergo change from transitional (action) constructions to non-transitional (activity) constructions. Nothing prevents us from reading (23) as something going on, should the context invite

us to do so. But it cannot be shown to be a coded opposition to the periphrastic passive as far as Aktionsart is concerned: the *s*-mood is just more abstract in this respect.

(23) *der* skrives *på indledningen*
there write-PRES S-MOOD on the introduction
'the introduction is being written, such is the plan' or 'the introduction is to be written'

(24) *der* bliver skrevet *på indledningen*
there become-PRES write-PAST PTC on the introduction
'actual writing of the introduction is going on'

2.7 Status

We have now delimited what we believe should be regarded as the inflectional mood paradigm within the Danish passive category, and we have characterized it in terms of an opposition between subjective anchoring (subjective consciousness) and objective anchoring (propositionally described consciousness).

There is no such inflectional system in the active voice. This situation begs the question whether there are alternative ways of manifesting this content distinction, that can - partly or fully - serve the same purpose in the active voice. We find such a way in the word order rules for indefinite Danish subjects.

3. The linear coding systems of Danish

We shall now briefly overview the content and expression functions of Danish word order. Danish word order is densely coded: approaching from the content, we can set up

four different content systems that word order can express:

- grammatical relations (esp. the indirect object vs. direct object opposition)
- illocutionary frames (and illocutionary suprasegmentals)
- information structure (in the sense of topic-focus articulation)
- mood

We shall discuss these systems with a particular focus on mood[7]. This use may seem paradoxical, since tradition reserves the term for inflectionally manifested modality (cf. 2.3. above). Our point, however, is that not only does Danish word order manifest similar content to that of the inflectional passives: in fact, it manifests the very same language-specific content options.

Of the above word order systems, grammatical relations will be omitted in this context. We shall briefly sketch the illocutionary frame system before turning to the modal system.

3.1 Illocutionary frame

With respect to main clause word order, Danish is a strict V2 language, or rather finite V2 language: apart from conjunctions, there is only one position P1 to the left of the finite verb (Vf). Although Danish is generally considered to be an SVO language, its main clause surface word order is really XVSO, where X can, but need not be the position for S.

A constituent in P1 marks the clause as declarative, whereas a main clause with a zero P1, thus starting with Vf, is marked as nondeclarative, preferably interrogative:

(25) a. Dansk er *et Vf2-sprog*
Danish is a Vf2-language
'Danish is a Vf2-language'

b. Ø Er dansk *et Vf2-sprog?*
Ø Is Danish a Vf2-language?
'Is Danish a Vf2-language?'

This contrast constitutes the illocutionary frame for Danish main clauses, in so far as this is determined by word order.

(26) main declarative clause:

P1	Vf	Subj	Adv1	Vi	Obj	Adv2
Muligvis	*har*	*jeg*	*ikke*	*forstået*	*det*	*rigtigt*
Possibly	have	I	not	understood	it	correctly

"Possibly, I haven't understood it correctly"

P1 is the only position to allow almost any constituent. Structurally viewed, P1 is a free position (although in actual text the unmarked choices are in fact quite restricted). Full NP subjects or the dummy *der* 'there' are very often placed in P1, as favoured unmarked constituents. The rest of the positions are more or less defined by relational values; alternative fillings of these positions are heavily restricted.

The rightmost part of the clause is reserved for the constituents that constitute the rest of the State of Affairs (SoA) of the clause, in so far as they have not found a position further left in the clause. Notice that two objects can share the position Obj. as in (27a), but not a subject and an object (27b):

(27) a. P1 Vf Vi Objects Adv2
En mand har givet sin kone et slag *i ansigtet*
'A man has given his wife a blow in the face'

b.	P1	Vf	Vi	Objects	Adv2
	**Der*	*har*	*slået*	en mand sin kone	*i ansigtet*

There has beaten a man his wife in the face

'A man has beaten his wife in her face'

3.2 *Der* 'there'- constructions - the traditional view

A factor that is crucial for our purposes is the function of the so-called dummy *der* 'there'. The insertion of this dummy has been seen as a consequence of the morphological definiteness option, such that definite Danish subjects are said to occur in P1 or in the specific subject position Subj., and indefinite subjects to go to object position. There is general agreement that such indefinite subjects are by all topological criteria objects, whereas other criteria, e.g. identity of semantic roles, point to their subject status. This common Scandinavian feature is then interpreted as a reflection of the principle of the growing informational importance of sentence constituents proceeding from left to right along the word order of the clause, which again gives rise to pragmatic interpretations in the following vein: '*der*-constructions are used whenever the subject is new information, or focus' (cf. e.g. Enkvist 1974). If that were true, all new, indefinite subjects would be introduced by *der*, but this is not the only content option behind Danish *der*-clauses. Of course focalization is involved, but there are two more systems involved and thus no clearly isomorphic relation between word order and for example the principle of focus structure. We have already mentioned the interplay between clause type and illocutionary frame. The second constraint is linear expression of mood.

3.3 Mood and linearity in Danish

Danish topology includes a mood system. With indefinite subjects, this language draws the very same content distinction as with the passives: the indefinite subject of the *der* 'there' construction is in object position and manifests subjective mood while the indefinite subject in normal subject positions expresses objective mood[8]. The system is neutralized in clauses with a definite subject (categorial sentences), but comes into full bloom with indefinite subjects, i.e. with discourse referent introduction.

This distinction is probably hard to grasp for the non-native reader, but simple declarative clauses with an indefinite subject in subject position cannot function in Danish as assertive statements of fact. To attune the English speaking reader to the problem, we shall borrow from Peter Harder (1991) the following example, which we shall interpret for our own purposes. The modal function of the indefinite subject in Danish is a pervasive feature of Danish topology, in fact its rules are even transferred to non-native English spoken by Danes. Most Danes know about the state of Denmark from Hamlet's famous lines, but few people get the wording right: *Something is rotten in the state of Denmark*, since this pattern cannot be a simple, subjectively anchored constative in Danish. The word order pattern of Danish subjective linear mood lies behind the alternative popular wording: *There is something rotten in the state of Denmark*. The following examples must be understood with this in mind.

3.4 The content of topological mood

We shall begin by showing the opposition between instances of simple factual description and inserted narrators - thus reversing the order of senses given in the analysis of the passives.

The situational description (28a) shows the subject in object position in the *der* 'there' construction, whereas the non-subjective reading has the indefinite subject in

normal subject position (28b):

(28) a. *Der kommer* en mand *gående ud fra*
there come-PRES ACT a man walking out from
Bellevue Strandhotel
Bellevue Beach Hotel
'a man comes walking out from the B.S.' or 'there is a man walking out of the B.S.'

b. En mand *kommer* *gående ud fra*
a man come-PRES ACT walking out from
Bellevue Strandhotel
Bellevue Beach Hotel
'a man comes walking out from the B.S.'

(28a) is a simple assertive statement of fact, whereas every Danish speaker will be able to identify example (28b) as a possible extract from fiction, anecdotal storytelling or the like. When introducing discourse referents, Danish speakers have to choose between anchoring the discourse subjectively, i.e. in the speaker, or inserting some non-subjective consciousness or narrator.

Similar tests could have been made on the basis of (29), but we use this example to exclude another parameter, namely importance and non-importance as a discourse referent. In (29), the beginning of a famous Danish novel, the indefinite subject establishes an important discourse referent continuing for pages, while in (30), also from a novel, no important referent is established. Indefinite subjects in subject position are new discourse referents, but they do not code communicative importance.

(29) *For en del år siden* *døde* en ældre mand *på Østerbro efter*
Some years ago died an elderly man in Østerbro after

at have spist et maltbolsje.
having eaten a malt drop.
'Some years ago an elderly man died in Østerbro after having eaten a malt drop.'

Han holdt meget af maltbolsjer. Han havde spist dem regelmæssigt gennem mange år og det var gået godt hidtil.. (Sch:5)
He was very fond of malt drops. He had eaten them regularly for many years, and it had gone well up till now..'

(30) is a police rehearsal of the facts and possible evidence of a murder case; the facts are reported, i.e. the speaker is enacting a text within the text, inserting a narrator that summarizes the facts of the case, reminding the other policemen of them. They are not presented as the direct experience of the speaker:

(30) Det er naturligvis den teori I må gå ud fra, siger
Jakobsen (..) Gammeldags motiver. Et *civilt* mord!
- Men ikke et rovmord? siger Nielsen lavt. - Ikke med en maskinpistol?
- Baumann havde et betydeligt beløb i tegnebogen.

'This is of course the theory you must start from, says Jakobsen (..) Old-fashioned motives. A civil murder.
- But not a murder with intent to rob? says Nielsen in a low voice. - Not with a machine-gun?
- Baumann had a considerable amount of money in his wallet.

Og	et værdifuldt armbåndsur	*sad på hans håndled* (Bo:21)
And	a valuable watch	was on his wrist.'

These examples show that also an indefinite subject can manifest narrated or imaginary worlds or scenarios, e.g. as here a summary of facts.

We shall now proceed to instances of propositionally inserted consciousness or point-of-view. The text in (31) describes an incident between Afghani resistance groups and Soviet troops:

(31) Da et vindstød rev hul i røgen og støvet, så han banditternes stilling. Den lå skråt nede til venstre. De havde kilet maskingeværet fast mellem to klippeblokke. Morteren måtte være lige bagved det lille plateau. Han talte fem-
'When a blast of wind tore a hole in the smoke and the dust, he saw the bandits' position. It was way down to the left. They had jammed the machine gun between two pieces of rock. The mortar must be behind the small plateau. He counted five or

seks mand i kikkerten.	*En stor knægt*	lå	på
six men in his binoculars.	*A young lad*	was lying	on

kanten af en klippe og prøvede at dirigere morterskytten. De var for langt væk til at de kunne ramme dem med sikkerhed. Morteren var den farlige. (Da:18)
the edge of a rock trying to direct the man firing the mortar. They were too far away to be able to hit them with any certainty. The mortar was the dangerous thing.'

Whereas (28b) and (30) were plain examples of thetic sentences in fiction, (31) shows that the position of the indefinite subject can manifest particular objective (non-subjective) consciousness: the indefinite subject marks the point of view as inside the soldier using his binoculars, and not inside the empathetic narrator, experiencing the

incident through his fictive character with the binoculars.

And finally, we have generic interpretations:

(32) en ræv *spiser* *ikke gulerødder*
a fox eat-PRES ACT not carrots
'a fox does not eat carrots'

(33) Og de gange i løbet af 50'erne, hvor min far brød sammen psykisk og måtte tage på lange rekreationsophold, bevarede jeg det som en dyb hemmelighed, hvor han var.
'and those times during the 50's when my father broke down mentally and had to go on convalescence for long periods, I kept where he was as a deep secret'.

En mand *brød* *jo ikke sammen på den måde,*
A man broke for sure not down in that way,

rystede og græd og gemte sig i huset, hvis der kom besøg. (Beh:30)
'A man did not break down in such a way, shaking and weeping and hiding himself, if there were visitors.'

3.6 Transitive verbs and *der*-clefts

This modal contrast in the position of the indefinite subject is only a plain systematic option where the clause contains no object, i.e. with intransitive verbs. As stated above, a subject and an object cannot coexist in object position; thus (34a) is impossible. In cases with an object two possible word order patterns are open: one the default option, whereby the subject goes to one of the remaining possible positions P1 or Subject, as shown in (34b).

(34) a. **Der forlader* en mand Bellevue Strandhotel
There leave-PRES ACT a man Bellevue Beach Hotel
'A man leaves Bellevue Beach Hotel'

b. En mand *forlader* *Bellevue Strandhotel.*
A man leave-PRES ACT Bellevue Beach Hotel.
'A man leaves Bellevue Beach Hotel'

Bag ham svinger døren c ɛ dæmper musikken. (Bo:5)
Behind him the door swings and subdues the music.

(34b) automatically becomes a non-subjective reading; the fiction reading is obvious from the context of the construction.

The third option - and in fact the only way transitive verbs can partake of subjective readings and thus circumvent non-subjectivity - is the so-called *der* cleft sentence construction. This construction makes use of the general morphology of the subjective reading: the positional subject marker *der* 'there' + copula *være/blive* 'be/become' + the subject in object position. The now disallowed object is attached to the subject together with the remaining constituents of the original clause in the shape of a relative clause:

(34) c. Der er en mand *der forlader Bellevue Strandhotel*
There is a man that leaves Bellevue Beach Hotel
'A man leaves Bellevue Beach Hotel' or 'There is a man leaving Bellevue Beach Hotel'

The result is the existential cleft, the typical and in fact the only way of introducing indefinite subjects as discourse referents with transitive verbs in an exclusively subjective reading. An indefinite subject in P1/subject position automatically evokes an objective reading.

The objective reading with transitives is particularly frequent in texts like news telegrams. We interpret this usage as narrator marking, in this case the existence of former actual narrators. The modal signal in news texts is: we have this from elsewhere. Reservation on the speaker's part is not structurally implied, although this is of course a possible, contextually determined extra dimension.

(35) En 73-årig tidligere overbetjent fra Horsens *skal til-*
'A 73-year old former police inspector from Horsens is to

bringe yderligere en halv snes dage i arresten i Silkeborg. (Pol.20.2.1993:I,4)
spend another 10 days in gaol in Silkeborg'

It goes without saying that such examples are also promoted by the need for compact text, but there is no reason to disregard this genre as an example of mood.

3.6 Delimiting the contrast: the role of *der*

We have claimed that the expression system involved is only a matter of the positions involved (subject vs. object position). One might ask why *der* (and its deictic counterpart *her*) are not involved. The reason why we think they have no links to the mood system, neither to the inflectional passive system nor to the linear system, is that they combine freely with the two passive moods. Given that the meaning distinctions involved are the same for linear and inflectional mood, we would expect a restriction here, if *der* were involved in subjective linear mood. There is no such restriction:

(36) a. *der* *snydes*
there cheat-PRES S-MOOD
'people/they cheat, as a rule'

b. *der* *bliver* *snydt*
there become-PRES cheat-PAST PTC
'actual cheating is going on'

(37) a. *her* *rulles*
here mangle-PRES S-MOOD
'mangling offered'

b. *her* *bliver* *rullet*
here become-PRES mangle-PAST PTC
'mangling is (actually) going on'

Thus, there is reason to believe that *der* and *her* do not contribute to the subjective meaning of other *der/her*-constructions either, but that this is signalled solely through the object position of the valency-bound subject (see (28a)).

4. Mood as a paradigm in Danish

Does mood form a paradigm in Danish? It certainly forms a content category with two distinct options. As far as the concept of a paradigm is concerned, it is normally taken to imply variation in one column in relation to another invariant column, the frame. Another characteristic of classical paradigms is that only one member of the paradigm can occur in the syntagmatic frame at a time. Judged on the basis of this traditional notion of paradigm, mood in Danish would seem to be a rather unusual one, bringing together a morphological distinction within the voice system and a subsystem that is neutral with respect to voice, namely a feature clustering for the subject: a linked option between definiteness and subject positions. The morphological verb paradigm is asymmetrical from the outset in two respects (there is no mood in the active, and it con-

sists of an inflectional and a periphrastic member). What unites these seemingly disparate expression systems is the exact parallelism of the content options in the two subparadigms, passive and subject position. What this situation calls for is actually a revised and extended notion of paradigm, where a content-based subtype is recognized[9]. Just as traditional paradigms are expression-based, a paradigm can be content-based. We shall count as content-based paradigms only cases where the content oppositions are fully stable. In our case, the superparadigm of mood is content-based only, and so is the word order system for the indefinite subject, while the two remnant subparadigms (mood within the passive and definiteness) are also expression-based paradigms.

Setting up this content paradigm for mood does not imply that the two immediate subparadigms are symmetrical in their respective paradigmatic structure. First, the morphology of the verb neutralizes the mood distinction in the active voice, and secondly, the positional subject opposition exists only for the indefinite subject; the definite subject is neutral.

The heterogeneous expression structure of the Danish mood paradigm facilitates syntagmatic combinations of members from the two subparadigms, since the two expression systems of the paradigm (predicate formation and subject formation) come together in most sentences in a natural way. The passives combine with an option from the definiteness paradigm within the same clause, and this again raises the question of redundancy and inconsistency.

Redundancy occurs in many examples, for example (10), (11), (21), and (note 5:1). This is not detrimental to our idea, since content reduncancy is a normal feature of the way grammaticalized systems function (e.g. number agreement between predicate and subject).

Inconsistency would be expected to arise from choices within the same clause of opposite members of the paradigm. Such inconsistencies do not arise, and this, then, is the phenomenon in need of explanation.

In two of the cases, no inconsistency can arise, for internal structural reasons alone. In active clauses the active verb does not inflect for mood, and the mood

distinction lies with the definiteness distinction in the P1 and the subject position alone:

(38) a. En tør hvidvin *gør sig* til forretten
a dry white wine will go well with the first course
'a dry white wine will go well with the first course'

b. Den tørre hvidvin *gør sig* *til forretten*
The dry white wine will go well with the first course
'the dry white wine will go well with the first course'

In passive clauses, only noun phrases in P1 or subject position have subject status; no promotion of an object noun phrase is obligatory in passive sentences in Danish (cf. Falster Jakobsen (this volume), Hansen and Heltoft (in prep.)). Unpromoted constituents in object position in Danish are still objects[10]. Objects do not participate in the mood-distinction, which then rests with the predicate alone:

(39) a. Der drikkes en tør hvidvin *til forretten*
There drink-PRES S-MOOD a dry white wine with the first course
'a dry white wine will be drunk with the first course'

b. *Der* *bliver* *drukket*
There become-PRES drink-PAST PTC

en tør hvidvin *til forretten*
a dry white wine with the first course
'a dry white wine will be drunk with the first course'

The only combination that could allow a contradiction to arise is the following type:

(40) En tør hvidvin bliver drukket *til forretten*
a dry white wine become-PRES drink-PAST PTC with the first course

'a dry white wine is normally drunk with the first course' or 'a dry white wine is being drunk with the first course'

Here the indefinite subject in itself marks objective mood and the passive in itself marks subjective mood. The example is neither inconsistent nor ungrammatical. Therefore this raises the question as to which marking wins out and why. Generally, as in this example, it seems to be the subject: the subject sets the point of view, the location of consciousness, and once this is set, the speaker is free to choose either option in the passive system. The subject is the modal key to the text: the point of view is set to that of an inserted narrator, which again opens a separate textual universe. Inside this universe one is free to locate the consciousness in both moods: either the original speaker can use the *s*-mood to continue marking the inserted narrator or he can retire from the textual surface and let the inserted narrator take over. The inserted narrator now acts as the speaker, hence the subjective mood of the predicate. In terms of the layered structure of the clause, the mood signalled by an indefinite S in P1 (or in Subj.) takes scope over the mood signalled by the choice of passive.

Notice that in the normative/generic reading of (40) the explanation is fully parallel to the analysis of cooccurring past *s*-moods and periphrastic moods in 2.4. The periphrastic passive has a general or iterative reading leading to an interpretation virtually identical to that of the *s*-mood.

Summing up this section, we would stress the importance for grammaticalization studies of the notion of complexity in category-formation. A language such as Danish, with a limited inflectional morphology and a word order system with very few free positions, can put these seemingly restricted means to a variety of uses, by letting options of other well-established paradigms cluster to form yet another grammatical category.

Sticking to single parameters or to functions of already well-known categories is a strategy that may hamper our understanding of the economy and complexity of particular grammatical systems.

5. Linear expression of mood and information structure

The choice of variables from two parameters was sufficient for the shaping of a mood paradigm, namely the content option +/- identifiable (the content system of definiteness) and the three possible subject positions: P1, S and O. Our point in this context is that these systems are obligatory and hierarchically prior to the information structural system of old and new information, of non-focus and focus. Indefinite non-generic subjects are new discourse referents and in this sense new information, but what determines the position of an indefinite subject is not its status as 'new' but its modal function. Nor are focus and Hallidayan given-new structure primarily involved, since a choice in P1 in the +/- definite system does not seal off the position: it is still open for choices within the parameters +/- given and +/- focus.

We have announced a widening of the perspective in order to relate our analysis to theories of iconicity within information structure. This we shall now do with a view to clarifying our position as to linguistic content. Therefore no in-depth analyses will be offered of theories of clausal message structure. We shall refer to just as much alternative theory as is necessary to clarify our own position.

Theories of iconicity in message structure claim a direct relationship between cognitively based information structure and linguistic expression. We shall consider two possible interpretations of what iconic information structure might mean:

(a) Informativity increases as we move from left to right with respect to clausal positions. The more we move to the right, the greater the information load the linguistic items involved will carry. In plain terms: iconic linearity means that contextually given

elements will show up at the beginning of the sentence, contextually unbound (new) elements will go to the right, towards the end of the clause. This applies to the concept of focus as well. A normal focus will fall in the rightmost part of the clause. This assumption of naturalness lies behind the information-structural works of the modern Prague School (Firbas 1964).

(b) The positions inside the clause contain less and less information load as we move from left to right. In Givon's version the first position contains the most salient piece of information (1990:972). The principle behind this is 'task urgency'.

Iconicity is taken - loosely - to imply naturalness conditions on syntactic structure or isomorphism between the syntactic code and its semantic or pragmatic designatum. The key notion implied here is transparency, namely that between expression and 'natural' designata. Syntax is supposed to mirror (cognitively or pragmatically) natural content distinctions.

We have no wish to contest the view that 'natural' cognitive and discourse-functional distinctions are important for linguistic theory and for syntax in particular. What we do want to oppose is the preconception that isomorphism in the sense defined above (i.e. between cognitive universals and grammatical expression systems) should be a basic and straightforward notion which applies in the same manner to all languages (cf. Engberg-Pedersen, this volume).

As far as the relationship between word order and message structure is concerned, we argue that in Danish, whichever version of iconic linear constituent ordering one might adhere to, the content layer of this iconic relation is buried below thick layers of conventional, historically determined and topologically expressed content systems. Furthermore, the mood system is apparently the stronger one. Where iconicity as a superior ordering principle in message structure is concerned, Danish respects neither the principle of interpretating old information before new information, nor the principle of task urgency interpretation: informative constituents are placed to the right

in one mood, but to the left in the other. The same positions and the material filling them serve several content purposes at the same time. The outcome of this observation is a warning: one should not attach functions to isolated parameters, but only to parameters seen in a hierarchical ordering.

7. A final perspective

The category of mood is part of the specific expression and content system that Danish imposes on the semantic substance of subjectivity. Subjectivity is dealt with in many recent contributions to content-oriented linguistic theory, e.g. Lyons (1977), Langacker (1983, 1990), Givón (1984-1990), Dik (1989), Hengeveld (1987), and Nuyts (1992). Whatever the differences between these authors and schools, they have one outlook in common, namely the identification of content with cognitive and/or communicative substance.

The Danish mood paradigm we have presented was derived from the analysis of the morphological *s*-mood: the expression form has a content form, and this again has been abstracted from concrete Danish clausal contrasts. Content forms cannot come from nowhere, but once they have been abstracted it is fully legitimate to search for alternative manifestations. We see this kind of hermeneutic circle as fruitful since it has an empirical foundation in the language investigated. What we cannot do is to postulate meaning elements, let alone universals of meaning. The point of departure for linguistics is the sign in its totality.

Thus our analysis points to the need to insist that coding takes place at both levels: expression and content. In this sense, the unity of content structure and expression structure in the sign is socially and historically determined (hence the arbitrariness of the sign). It is exactly in such language- specific, historically determined meaning distinctions that we have been investigating that this becomes apparent, and there is no other access to such content distinctions than the laborious way of digging them out

through detailed analyses of particular languages.

An adequate metaphor would thus be not just a plain mirror (with more or less dirt on it), but rather one of the sort you will find in the gallery of mirrors in Copenhagen's Tivoli, distorting iconicity in the sign relation, sometimes strongly, and sometimes even to the point of making it unrecognizable. Most important is the position of the mirror. It is not just hanging on the expression side of the sign, but is bolted to its language-specific content.

Notes:

1.We are grateful to a number of linguists who have criticized former versions, especially to Peter Harder for thorough criticism, and to Per Durst-Andersen, Svein Lie (Oslo), Una Canger, Michael Fortescue and Elisabeth Engberg-Pedersen.

2.This idea was originally suggested to us by Per Durst-Andersen (Copenhagen).

3.Since we are not primarily discussing markedness, we need not discuss the alternative, participative relationship, where the unmarked option is a zero-category.

4.Central to Givón's notion of markedness is the view that it arises from the relationship between discourse functional and cognitive contextual factors and syntactic expressions. The notion of normality behind the scenes is of course a 100% isomorphic relationship between content and expression, and deviations from that ideal result from stretching or shrinking of the syntactic expression, stretching being underdetermination of the syntactic expression, shrinkage being overdetermination, and isomorphism again being the ideal state, where iconicity is reflected one-to-one.

5. (1a) and (2a) below are examples from headlines. Here a dynamic reading within the category of Aktionsart seems tempting:

(1) a. *DANSK ALARM: EF-REGLER* BRYDES
Danish alert: EC-rules break-PRES S-MOOD
'Danish alert: EC-rules are being broken' or 'EC-rules are broken (as a norm)'(Berl.T.16.09.1993:1, headline)

(2) a. *GORAZDE* EROBRES
Gorazde seize-PRES S-MOOD
'Gorazde is being seized' or 'Gorazde reported to be seized' or (less relevant in situation) 'Gorazde to be seized' (Berl.T., on the very day of

the capture of G. by the Serbs, with no 100% reliable sources)

We claim, however, that this is due to the *s*-mood's lying wholly outside the Aktionsart system and therefore neutral with respect to the opposition dynamic vs. static. The alternatives (1b) and (2b) demand readings that are in their actual context undesired, namely predictions of change or statements of perfective result:

(1) b. *DANSK ALARM:* *EF-REGLER* BLIVER/ER
Danish alert: EC-rules become-PRES/is-PRES

BRUDT
break-PAST PTC
'Danish alert: EC-rules will be broken' or 'EC-rules have been broken'

(2) b. *GORAZDE* BLIVER/ER EROBRET
Gorazde become-PRES/is-PRES seize-PAST PTC
'Gorazde will be/has been seized'

To the undesired semantics here the *s*-form remains the only available alternative (the lesser of two evils). The *s*-form never demands an Aktionsart reading and is therefore open to a contextually determined imperfective interpretation, as in for example (2a). The normal interpretation of (2a) is that there is a decision according to which Gorazde will be seized. But by means of contextual influence the *s*-mood is here squeezed into the semiaspectual function of a passive: what it says is that the taking of Gorazde has not been completed. Because the *s*-mood also still demands its own semantic functions, the example is polysemous, and it remains somewhat awkward to the native speaker.

6.Example (22a) documents the propositional intention reading. This reading of the *s*-mood is frequent in headlines; compare also:

(1) *NEPOTISME* TAGES *OP I TINGET*
nepotism bring-PRES S-MOOD up in Parliament
'nepotism to be brought up in Parliament'
(Berl.T. 16.09.1993:9, headline)

Such *s*-mood headlines report the content of somebody else's mind, so that the 1st person of newspaper headlines does not vouch for the realization of the action described in the verbal predication of (22) for example, but only for the existence in some agent of an intention to make the predication come true. In (1) the speaker vouches only for the existence of an intention to bring up the case.

7. Danish traditional grammar (Høysgaard 1747, 1752; Mikkelsen 1975[1911], Diderichsen 1946) and Danish topological theory (Diderichsen 1946, Bjerrum et al. 1966) have overlooked this system, although the generic/normative reading has been noticed (Mikkelsen 1975, Diderichsen 1946). Its relation to the passives has not been

noticed, but strikingly, in Mikkelsen (1975:24-25) all examples of the normative/generic subject reading have the *s*-passive, and all examples of *der*-constructions with the subject in object position have the periphrastic passive.

8.The positional or expletive subjects *der* 'there'/*her* 'here' do not contribute to the opposition (see 3.6.).

9.For a more detailed exposition, see Heltoft (this volume).

10.Sceptics should notice three further interesting things about the passive in Danish. First, the constitutive feature in passive formations is subject demotion. If there is no object promotion, *der* is inserted. The rule applies even to intransitives, e.g.

(1) der danses
there dance-S-PASS
'dancing is planned, scheduled'

(2) der bliver danset
there become-PRES dance-PAST PTC
'dancing is going on'

Secondly, already at the outset when Danish still had morphological case, the first step in the grammaticalization process leading to (39b) in Modern Danish, was in evidence, namely the formation of subjectless clauses with the object in the accusative and no agreement. Thus from the Old Danish dialect of Scania (Bjerrum 1966):

(3) fore thy ath summum stathum
for this-DAT that some-DAT PL place-DAT PL

taxs undan
take-PRES S-PASS 3SG away

twa lotær af rughsæth
two-ACC lot-NOM/ACC PL of rye grain

'because in some places two lots of rye grain are taken away'
(ScL 238, text 2)

Third, the reflexive pronouns *sig* 'himself/herself/itself, themselves' and *sin* 'his/her/its/-their' can refer to subjects only. They refer neatly to subjects in object position:

(4) der kommer en student med sin kæreste
there comes a student with refl. sweetheart
'a student comes with his sweetheart'

The lack of coreference in (5) is a good indication that the object in (5) is not in any

sense a subject and thus it is not a demoted passive subject either (Svein Lie, personal communication).

(5) *der blev hentet en student af sin kæreste
there was fetched a student by refl. sweetheart
'a student was picked up by his sweetheart'

(5) demands a genitive, *hans* 'his' in the present example.

References:

Bech, Gunnar 1952. Semantische Entwicklungsgeschichte der hochdeutschen Modalverba. *Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-Filologiske Meddelelser, bind 32, nr.6.* København: Ejnar Munksgaard.

Benveniste, Émile 1958. De la subjectivité dans le langage. Journal de Psychologie. Reprinted in Benveniste 1966.

Benveniste, Émile 1960. 'Être' et 'avoir' dans leurs fonctions linguistiques. Reprinted in Benveniste 1966.

Benveniste, Émile 1966. *Problèmes de Linguistique Générale I-II.* Paris: Gallimard.

Bjerrum, Anders 1966. *Grammatik over Skånske Lov [Grammar of the Scanian Law].* København: Københavns Universitets fond til tilvejebringelse af læremidler.

Bjerrum, Anders et.al.(eds.)1966. *Paul Diderichsen. Helhed og Struktur. Udvalgte sprogvidenskabelige Afhandlinger.* København: C.E.G. Gads forlag.

Bolkestein, Machtelt 1992. Anaforische Subjecten en Tekststructuur in het Latijn. Gramma/TTT I,2, p.111-124.

Bolkestein, Machtelt, Jan Nuyts and Co Vet (eds.) 1990. *Layers and Levels of Representation in Language Theory: a Functional View.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Booth, Wayne C. 1961. *The Rhetoric of Fiction.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Diderichsen, Paul 1946. *Elementær dansk Grammatik.* København: Gyldendal.

Dik, Simon S. 1989. *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part 1: The Structure of the Clause.* Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Durst-Andersen, Per 1992. *Mental Grammar. Russian aspect and related issues.* Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.

Durst-Andersen, Per og Michael Herslund (this volume). *The Syntax of Danish Verbs: Lexical and Syntactic Transitivity.*

Enkvist, Niels Erik 1974. Några textlingvistiska grundfrågor. Ulf Teleman and Tor G. Hultman (eds.), Språket i Bruk. Lund: Liber läromedel Lund. Gleerups, p.172-206.

Firbas, J. 1964. On defining the theme in functional sentence analysis. *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague 1*, 267-280.

Givón, Talmy 1984. *Syntax I.* A Functional-Typological Introduction. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Givón, Talmy 1990. *Syntax II.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Haberland, Hartmut and Lars Heltoft 1992. Universals, Explanations and Pragmatics. Michel Kefer and Johan van der Auwera (eds.), *Grammar and Meaning - Cross Linguistic Perspectives.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 17-26.

Hansen, Erik 1966. Prædikativ og adverbial. Et eksperiment i traditionel grammatik. Loman and Sigurd (eds.): *Svenskans beskrivning 2.* Lund, p. 70-81.

Hansen, Erik and Lars Heltoft (in prep.). *Grammatik over det Danske Sprog* [Grammar of the Danish Language]. København: Munksgaard.

Harder, Peter 1991. *Kontrastivt kompendium.* København: Engelsk Institut, Københavns Universitet.

Harder, Heltoft and Nedergaard-Thomsen (this volume). Danish Directional Adverbs.

Heltoft, Lars 1994. *S*-modus og perifrastisk modus i dansk. *Språkbruk, grammatik och språkförandring. En festskrift till Ulf Teleman 13.1. 1994.* Institutionen för Nordiska Språk, Lunds Universitet.

Heltoft, Lars 1995. Predicative Adjectives and Adverbials as Valency Bearers. Lene Schøsler and Sabine Kirchmeier-Andersen (eds.).

Hengeveld, P.C. 1987. Clause Structure and modality in Functional Grammar. Van der Auwera and Goossens (eds.), *Ins and Outs of the Predication.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Hjelmslev, Louis 1935. La Catégorie des Cas I. Étude de grammaire générale. *Acta Jutlandica VIII*, Århus: Universitetsforlaget i Aarhus.

Hjelmslev, Louis 1966[2]. *Omkring Sprogteoriens Grundlæggelse.* København: Akademisk Forlag. Translated by Francis J. Whitfield (1963): *Prolegomena to a Theory of Language.* Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Hopper, Paul J. and Elizabeth Closs Traugott 1993. *Grammaticalization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Juul, H. and P. Skadhauge 1995. Perspektiver i dansk passiv. Manuskript.

Keenan, Edward L. 1976. Towards a Universal Definition of "Subject", Charles N. Li (ed.).

Kemmer, Suzanne 1993. *The Middle Voice*. Typological Studies in Language 23. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kleiber, Georges 1993. *Prototypensemantik*. Eine Einführung. Narr Studienbücher. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1985. Observations and Speculations on Subjectivity. John Haiman (ed.), *Iconicity in Syntax: Proceedings of a Symposium on Iconicity in Syntax, Stanford, June 24-6, 1983*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1990. *Concept, Image and symbol. The Cognitive Basis of Language*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Li, Charles N. 1976. *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press.

Li, Charles N. and Sandra A. Thompson 1976. Subject and Topic. A New Typology of Language. In Charles N. Li (ed.), p. 457-490.

Lyons 1968. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Lyons 1977. *Semantics I-II*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Lyons 1982. Deixis and Subjectivity. Loquor, ergo sum? In Jarvella and Klein (eds.), *Speech, Place and Action. Studies in Deixis and Related Topics*. Chichester: John Wiley.

Meillet, Antoine 1966 [1937]. *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*. Forge Village, Mass.: Alabama University Press.

Mikkelsen, Kristian 1975 [1911]. *Dansk Ordföjningslære*. København: Hans Reitzel.

Nuyts, Jan 1992. Subjective vs. Objective Modality. Michael Fortescue, Peter Harder and Lars Kristoffersen. *Layered Structure and Reference in a Functional Perspective*. Papers from the Functional Grammar Conference in Copenhagen 1990. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, p. 73-98.

Rehling, Erik 1934. Om brug af passiv på dansk. *Sprog og kultur. Studier tilegnede Verner Dahlerup paa Femoghalvfjerdsaarsdagen.* Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, p. 80-88.

Schøsler, Lene and Sabine Kirchmeier-Andersen (eds.) 1994. *Studies in Valency I.* Odense: The University of Odense Press.

Vries, Lourens de (1993): Notional and Coded Information Roles. *Working Papers in Functional Grammar 52.* University of Amsterdam.

Sources:

ScL = The Scanian Law, in Brøndum-Nielsen, Johs. og Svend Aakjær (udg.) 1933. *Danmarks Gamle Landskabslove I,1-2. Skånske Lov.* København: Gyldendalske Boghandel. Nordisk Forlag.

Novels, newspapers, periodicals etc.:

Beh = Poul Behrendt: *Bissen og Dullen.* København: G(yldendal) P(aperback) 1984[3].

Berl.T. = Berlingske Tidende.

Bo = Anders Bodelsen. *Mørklægning.* Gyldendal 1988.

Da = Leif Davidsen. *Den sidste spion.* Lindhardt og Ringhof. 1991.

Inf. = Information.

Pol. = Politiken.

Sch = Hans Scherfig. *Det forsømte forår.* Gyldendals Tranebøger 1968.

Skalk = Tidsskriftet Skalk.

Paradigmatic structure, Word Order and Grammaticalization

Lars Heltoft
University of Roskilde

1. Overview

This article[1] is characterized by the same general interest as Engberg-Pedersen (this volume) and Harder (this volume), that of suggesting the need for a revised notion of structure in functionally oriented linguistics. However, the subject in focus, as indicated in the title, raises the question of the relation between synchrony and diachrony. Thus the article is in line with the general upsurge of interest in the diachronic perspective and in grammaticalization in particular (cf. Bybee, Pagliuca and Perkins 1994, Hopper and Traugott 1993, Christian Lehmann 1985, 1993).

Where grammaticalization is concerned, the notion of paradigm occupies a focal position. The traditional insight that grammatical structure involves organization of limited numbers of elements in closed paradigms is still of central value. Any analysis of grammaticalization processes presupposes the analysis of their structural inputs and outputs, the analysis of which again presupposes both the synchronic and the diachronic perspective. As I shall try to show, however, the concept of paradigm itself is in need of refinement. Functional orientation calls for new types of paradigms in addition to the traditional ones.

Tradition speaks of paradigms as expression-based. The classical notion is the morphological paradigm: a set of expressions ('endings') that fit into the same syntagmatic context: a word stem. Essentially the same notion was generalized to contexts of larger chains than stems: clauses and phrases, the outcome of which is syntactic paradigms (e.g. determiners in a language like English).

Approaches and theories have varied with respect to the roles they have ascribed

to content in both types of paradigm, but the general trend is to define the notion from the expression perspective. The classical European structuralist notions of paradigm point explicitly to content (Saussurean associative relations), but are nevertheless built on substitution in a syntagmatically defined context.

The point at issue is not to replace older notions by new ones, but to emphasize the need for a content-based notion alongside the traditional, still useful ones. There are two senses in which a paradigm can be content-based and thus there are two steps in this line of thought.

First, there is no a priori reason why substitution experiments should be exclusively arranged and defined from the expression perspective. Just as we can isolate stable syntagmatic expression contexts for the purpose of isolating paradigms, we can isolate stable content elements for the same purpose. Such a content element does the same job as the syntagmatic context in the expression-based notion. One obvious advantage of this approach is its applicability to problems of word order. The example I shall give below takes the propositional content as the contextual frame and the assertivity vs. non-assertivity option as the paradigm - a question of word order in a number of well-known Western European languages. Content elements are of course not linearly segmentable to the same degree as expression elements - but in this property of the content-based approach lies also its strength: it allows us to reformulate the criteria for grammaticality and grammaticalization to include word order phenomena.

The second step will lead us to the more radical view that we need a supplementary notion of paradigm defined solely in terms of the semantic contrasts involved, without any syntagmatically defined expression frame. Such a paradigm will allow us to scrutinize and revise the internal content structure of traditional expression-based paradigms; this will be exemplified below for the traditional category of case. Moreover, it will allow us to formulate similarities where others have emphasized differences. Content paradigms can straddle the most heterogeneous expression systems.

As to terminology, I shall simply speak of content-based paradigms as 'paradigms' without further qualification. Where reference is needed to older notions, I shall explicitly hedge these notions and speak of expression-based paradigms, and of morphological and syntactic paradigms.

Two general warnings must be issued already at this stage of the presentation. First, and most importantly, the absence of an expression frame does not imply that expression differences are not relevant; the programmatical content orientation of the approach does not imply loss of empirical foundation. On the contrary, only those content contrasts qualify that have corresponding, language specific expression differences found through application of the commutation test. In this way, content-defined paradigms remain empirically anchored within the language they are set up for. What one may have to renounce on - depending on the actual case - is only the ability to tie down content options to specific expression slots. It is still possible to relate content options to expression differences in general.

Secondly, the level of content we are operating at must not be thought of as content substance. Many authors have pointed to tense systems and time adverbials as different manifestations of time. They are indeed, but from our vantage point, this common content remains a matter of content substance. In a content-based paradigm, content substance is structurally organized, and it is this language-specific structure (content form, in the Hjelmslevian vein) imposed on content substance, that constitutes the paradigm. What this allows is the recognization of identical content paradigms with widely different expression systems. A detailed example relating inflectional voice to word order rules can be found in Heltoft and Falster Jakobsen (this volume, and compare the discussion later in this article); the choice of (un)specifiability in Nahuatl discussed in Canger (this volume) is another example.

Finally, when the concept of paradigm is adjusted, so are the central dynamic concepts of generalisation and reanalysis. Basing the notion of grammaticalization on language specific content structure will entail a wider range of application for these concepts, and, hopefully, increased insight into the relationship between language systems and processes of language change.

2. A wider concept of grammaticalization

In recent literature on grammaticalization word order systems are normally not

considered to have grammatical status, nor are their development considered as instances of grammaticalization. Hopper and Traugott (1993) emphasize the differences between word order change and grammaticalization in the narrow sense, namely the process from lexical item to affix. Yet the content functions of word order resemble those of indisputably grammatical categories: word order can express syntactic relations, illocutionary frame and subjectivity, and textual structure (discourse referent management, topicalization). Thus, word order can take on grammatical content normally ascribed to case, mood, and definiteness. Word order change can consist in changes from syntagmatic freedom to heavily restricted positional rules with a traditionally grammatical content.

The concepts of diachronic grammaticalization of today (Hopper and Traugott 1993, Traugott and Heine 1991, Lehmann 1985, 1993, and others, all ultimately building on Meillet 1921 [1912]) converge in viewing grammaticalization as a process of historical change, changing material from lexical status to bound morphemic status. By undergoing this process, lexical material loses 'in semantic pragmatic significance, syntactic freedom, and phonetic substance' (Heine and Reh 1984:15); in the wording of Christian Lehmann 1985, 'grammaticalization is a process which turns lexemes into grammatical formatives and makes grammatical formatives still more grammatical' (Lehmann 1985:303). Other authors view the starting point of the process as being farther away, i.e. in discourse categories (Li and Thompson 1976, Givón 1979, Bybee 1985, Hopper 1988). Where the endpoint of the bleaching and binding process is concerned, however, there is general agreement: bound morpheme status is the most tightly grammaticalized status a sign can have.

I shall discuss and question this view. Modern typologists pay due homage to Meillet as the inventor of the concept and the founder of grammaticalization as a diachronic discipline (Meillet 1948 [1912]), but strikingly, Hopper and Traugott, for instance, do not agree with Meillet when it comes to the limitation of the phenomena recognized as undergoing or resulting from grammaticalization. Meillet insists that word order change and prosodic change must be recognized as grammaticalization processes. The reluctance of Hopper and Traugott (1993:50-56) seems to stem from the view that unidirectionality is a central feature of grammaticalization, although they do acknowled-

ge the possibility of a wider concept of grammaticalization that would encompass word order change.

Grammaticalization processes need not begin from lexemes and their endpoint is not necessarily bound morpheme status, in fact they need not concern the level of lexemes at all. For instance, a discourse category such as *topic* can attain grammatical status in so-called topic-prominent languages, and these again may develop into subject-prominent languages (W.P. Lehmann 1976, Li and Thompson 1976). Vedic Sanskrit, according to W.P. Lehmann, presents a stage of this development. It has a grammatical subject, but almost never identifies subject and topic, whereas in Classical Sanskrit subject and topic are generally identified. Notably, this process does not involve any lexeme category.

My second example is the rise of Germanic V^2 out of former SOV-order. The starting point of this process is believed to be enclitic preposing of abstract 'auxiliary' verbs losing stress in V^2-position. The following example is from late Runic Norse (Faarlund 1990:60, Hock 1991:330; note that neither of these authors, however, recognize the concept of grammaticalization):

(1) *ni s* *solu* *sot*
not is sun-DAT sought
'neither is (it) sought by the sun'

And from Old English (Hock 1991:330):

(2) *Beowulfe* *weard* *guðhreð*
Beowulf-DAT become-PAST battle-glory-NOM

gyfeþe
give-PAST PTC
'To Beowulf was battle-glory given'

This preposing is first attested for the copula: compare the runic example's cliticized *s*

from *is/es* (3.p.sing.) in what is probably an instance of the Germanic periphrastic passive. (For the predicative nature of that construction, see Dyvik 1980). Because of the sparse material it remains unclear whether the start of this process was actually pure clitization, or whether it affected first a lexico-grammatical class of auxiliaries - but this concerns only the question of the starting point. The process in all Germanic V^2-languages is analogic extension of V^2-position to all finite verbs in main clauses, the endpoint being a new positional structure, not an inflectional system. We shall not discuss the content functions of older Germanic in details here, but the reader is reminded that the present day outcome of this process in for example German and the Scandinavian languages is a strictly regulated and - I shall claim - grammaticalized system where V^2-order indicates a declarative illocutionary frame and V^1-order a non-declarative frame (question, condition, imperative).

So far I have adopted the view that the concept of grammaticalization must apply not only to inflectional systems, but to word order systems as well. I shall further insist that grammaticalization as a historical process cannot be analyzed in isolation from synchronic analysis and vice versa, a view that I share with a number of authors (though my view is closest to C. Lehmann's 1985, 1993). And finally, under both perspectives (synchrony and diachrony) a common background is presupposed, namely a universal defi ion of what 'grammatical status' means. This enables us to orient and anchor empirical questions such as whether a language has a given grammatical category and if so how it arose (Dyvik 1980, 1986). The presupposed notion behind the discussion of the endpoint of grammaticalization processes is that of the grammatical status of a paradigm, i.e. what it takes for a paradigm to acquire grammatical status. The obvious and apposite term for having grammatical status (i.e. being grammaticalized in a language) is grammaticality. Of course, this term has been used in other senses already. As my interpretation of grammaticality is developed, it will become clear that it is merely a descriptive elaboration of the traditional sense of the word 'grammatical', i.e. constructed in accordance with the grammatical rules of a language, correct for the given language.

I side with Meillet in adopting a wider view of grammaticalization. Granted that

inflectional morphemes form prototypical grammatical paradigms, it still remains to be seen what the properties of such paradigms are, and to what extent they share these properties with other types of paradigm.

3. The concept of a paradigm

The notion of a paradigm and its specification into subtypes is crucial to our understanding of grammaticalization. Expression-based paradigms are found through substitution in an identifiable syntagmatic context, isolated for the purpose of the test and in this sense abstract.

Content-based paradigms, by contrast, are found through substitution against the background of a stable content element isolated by the linguist doing the test. Such a content element does the same job as the syntagmatic context in the expression-based view, namely to define the stable frame of the test, and, eventually, of the paradigm, but content elements are not linearly segmentable to the same degree as expression elements. Content elements can be complex and find their expression only through complex expression systems, with no simple or isomorphic relations between content and expression. Let us take Danish V^2 word order options as an example, as described in the following notional system: P^1 (cf. Dik 1989) is the initial position, in Danish open to material of all kinds, often - but not necessarily - filled by the given topic; V^2 is verb second; S stands for subject. Danish contrasts declarative P^1 V^2 (S) order with Zero V S order, the word order for questions and conditionals, as in:

(3) a. *hun* *kommer*
she comes
'she comes'

b. *Ø* *kommer* *hun*
comes she
'does she come' or 'if she comes'

One obvious stable content element that may constitute the frame of the test is the common propositional content 'her coming'; another candidate is 'assertivity' or 'reality', the values of which are specified in the paradigm as assertive vs. non-assertive. Assertivity is thus also the semantic domain of the paradigm. The output of the option (3ab) does not distinguish at the expression level between questions and conditionals: in both cases we find *Zero V*. We may speak of the common denominator for questions and conditionals as non-assertivity.

Notice that it is still a precondition for an alternation to count as an option that there should also be a contrast of expression. Thus, taking the next step in this linking of options calls for recognizing the relevant expression differences between questions and conditionals: questions are non-dependent (non-subordinate), whereas conditionals are dependent (subordinate).

(4) a. *Kommer hun?*
comes she?
'Does she come?'

b. *Kommer hun, går jeg*
comes she, leave I
'If she comes, I shall leave'

There is an obviously Hallidayan tenor behind this view (Halliday 1985). In Halliday, however, the criteria for relating systemic networks to language specific structure are not clearly spelled out (cf. the discussion in Butler 1988). In contrast, I shall emphasize the need for paradigm formation to be empirically anchored and non-arbitrary. In the present approach, there is no vicious circle hidden beneath and no contradiction lurking behind the concepts 'explication of content' and 'empirical', and the methodological tool assuring empirical status is again the commutation test.

As opposed to the classical expression-based paradigm approach, I allow approaches from both sides, the goal being precisely the same, namely the formulation of systematic expression-content correlations. Alternation, then, is substitutability in a

stable context, but it is not essential that this context should be a string of syntagmatically ordered morphemes. The conditions defining the paradigm may very well be a content element common to the elements in alternation. The overall view of language as a sign system forces us to recognize syntagmatic differences as alternating expressions of content oppositions, meaning that from the content perspective paradigms stand out as hierarchically ordered content options while of course still being systems of full-bodied signs, whose linkages are found through careful applications of the commutation test.

The double-sidedness of paradigms, and of the procedures involved in constructing them, is crucial in several of the articles found in this book. Both in Falster Jakobsen and Heltoft (this volume) and in Harder, Heltoft and Nedergaard-Thomsen (this volume), a dialectic between the expression-based and the content-based approach is employed.

4. Defining grammaticalization

All instances of grammaticalization concern closed paradigms - a view more in accordance with tradition. Prototypical grammatical status is ascribed to paradigms where the number of members in the paradigm is de facto determinable and limited. Less prototypical instances of grammaticalization will still be determinable and limited in principle, but they will have larger paradigms and thus consist of more specific content options. Thus the criteria for delimiting grammaticalization from full lexicalization are clear in principle, although actual instances may be difficult to assess. The core notion behind grammaticalization is that of a closed paradigm in a linked system of limited options, where linkage between A and B - to sum up whar I have said about paradigms - means that selecting one or more members from paradigm A calls for selection from another paradigm B. Paradigm A may be a closed one, but B must be closed. Grammar is the mechanism that handles all non-lexical relations between content form and expression form, and it does so by virtue of its status as a set of linked options.

Take the personal endings of the verb in Standard English as an example.

Paradigm B is represented by the well-known closed zero vs. *-s* option, the content of which is non-3p. sg. vs. 3p. sg., respectively. A consists of the option between two types of grammatical subjects, one triggering the non-3p. sg. zero morpheme, the other one triggering the 3p. sg. *s* morpheme. This is the well-known phenomenon normally called agreement.

Grammatical status pertains to productive rules. If A is a lexical category whose members trigger the grammatical paradigm B, the full grammatical status of B will depend on the openness of the option towards new members of A. In a fully productive system, any new member of A will also trigger the option B.

This concept of grammaticality will ascribe grammaticalized status to all linked and productive options in closed paradigms. I shall say - from a synchronic point of view - that such paradigms are grammaticalized in a language, and similarly - from a diachronic point of view - I shall refer to any process resulting in such relationships as grammaticalization.

Let me mention briefly a phenomenon from Danish, which will be dealt with in more detail in one of the other contributions to this book (Harder, Heltoft and Nedergaard Thomsen), namely unit accentuation.

Unit accentuation is the most important expression signal for Danish complex predicate formation. The finite verb is unstressed while the second part of the complex predicate carries full stress, e.g. in copula + subject complement *han ₀er 'sød* 'he is cute'. The unitary stress reflects a very important difference between two types of Danish directional expressions, namely complex predicate formation on the one hand with proper locatives, as in:

(5)	*de*	*₀sendte*	*pakken*	*til*	*Køben'havn*
	they	send-PAST	the parcel	to	Copenhagen

'they sent the parcel to Copenhagen'

Here there is unitary stress and a complex predicate *₀sendte til 'København*. On the

other hand expressions where human goals are involved, as in:

(6)	*de*	*'sendte*	*pakken*	*til*	*'Lone*
	they	send-PAST	the parcel	to	Lone
	'they sent the parcel to Lone'				

Here there is full verbal stress and two objects: direct object *pakken* and oblique object *til Lone*. Thus the directional preposition *til* 'to' is neutral in this respect, but choosing it always entails the further option between complex predicate formation giving the locational reading, and a simple verbal predicate giving the human reading. What we see here is a closed paradigm that resembles allative vs. dative oppositions in case languages.

Once we have moved from the expressional distinctions to this content opposition, we can apply the content perspective and search for alternative realizations borne by word-order. There are two more realizations of the human reading, namely indirect object constructions:

(7)	*de*	*'sendte*	*'Lone*	*'pakken*
	they	send-PAST	Lone	the parcel
	'they sent Lone the parcel'			

and the *få* 'become' passives upgrading the indirect object to subject status:

(8)	*Lone*	*fik*	*pakken*	*sendt*
	Lone	get-PAST	the parcel	send-PAST PTC.
	'Lone got the parcel sent' (i.e. received it)			

So the issue is reasonably clear: not only are the meanings attached to word order and unitary stress 'grammatical', but the sign options involved comply with our standards of grammaticality. Under this view, unidirectionality is not an inherent feature of grammaticalization processes, since inflectional systems are often replaced

by word order systems. A spiral model of grammaticalization processes would be more consistent with the view of grammar and grammatical status proposed here.

5. Parameters of grammaticalization and the concept of a paradigm

I have deliberately avoided the classical version of the distinction between paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations, between paradigms and syntagms. My position is of course in need of further clarification, and the best possible sparring partner to match this position against is Christian Lehmann in his works on grammaticalization (1985, 1993), Lehmann's background being also a version of classical European structuralism.

In Lehmann's theoretically elaborated works, the parameters of grammaticalization are described along both the paradigmatic and the syntagmatic axes. As paradigmatic features of strong grammaticalization he counts: few semantic features, a small, tightly integrated set of content options, systematically constrained choice, and largely obligatory use. Amongst the syntagmatic features of strong grammaticalization is what he calls fixation, the loss of syntagmatic variability, a concept formulated according to the delexicalization view of grammaticalization. In a slightly modified sense, this is also relevant for word order, since tighter positional demands means more strongly grammaticalized word order rules. (What he calls scope and bondedness are parameters intimately connected with the delexicalization view, and these parameters cannot be related to the discussion of word order). I cannot go into any detail, but must refer the reader to Lehmann's works (1985, 1992, 1993).

What I find particularly difficult to understand is Lehmann's distinction between the functions of word order and of inflectional morphology. He states that even in cases like subject and object placement in English, it is

> 'not word order alone which signals the grammatical relation; with most verbs, selection restrictions bear the main burden in the assignment of actant functions. The conclusion to be based on this argument is that word order

> does not have a positive expressive function, but much more a negative, oppositive function. It does not, like a grammatical affix, signify a particular grammatical relation; instead it functions rather like a phoneme by admitting or excluding a given grammatical relation.'(Lehmann 1992:399)

I do not see anything in this characterization that would not apply to quite normal, well-attested situations with inflectional morphology, e.g. case. The content of the Latin ablative is certainly a negatively defined semantic frame, inside which the actual shade of meaning is selected by the verb in question. More importantly, it is hard to see the point in stressing word order as syntagmatic variability:

> 'Word order is not an expression device on a par with inflectional morphology. Instead, it is an instance of the syntagmatic variability, and thus, a structural aspect of the autonomy of the language sign. Its freedom or fixation depends on which grammatical levels are particularly strongly developed in the language.' (Lehmann 1992:414)

Of course - and this is tautological - word order is an instance of syntagmatic variability, but in word order languages this variability is systematically restricted. True, word order is bound up with other levels of syntactic organization. Word order languages, for instance, must have group structure, to use a term adapted from Meillet (1964 [1937]:360), i.e. contiguous phrase structure, and only allow discontinuous constituents under grammatically restricted conditions. But Lehmann does not show, as his formulations would seem to imply, that free and fixed word order are consequences of such organization principles at other grammatical levels. What matters here is not the syntagmatic differences, but the paradigmatic similarities. Lehmann's concept of a paradigm is the classical, syntagmatically framed and restricted one. Paradigms are only found with sets of signs that share a syntagmatic context. I, on the contrary, would claim that on the one hand word order conforms largely to his paradigmatic parameters and criteria of grammaticalization, while, on the other hand, the classical syntagmatically framed concept of a paradigm is the

stumbling block that prevents one from straightforwardly viewing word order options as tightly grammaticalized phenomena.

Word order differences are sign differences that comply with all of Lehmann's paradigmatic features of strong grammaticalization, namely: few semantic features, a small, tightly integrated set of content options, systematically constrained choice, and largely obligatory use. Of the syntagmatic features, fixation would be relevant, if taken to mean restricted syntagmatic variability. For word order, more grammatical means fewer word order options and tighter positional demands.

The point is that Lehmann's paradigmatic parameters apply to word order as well, while the syntagmatic parameters must of course be reformulated. The obstacle in Lehmann's version that prevents inclusion of word order among grammaticalization phenomena is the preconception that paradigms presuppose syntagmatic contexts in a narrow sense, namely linearly ordered chains.

6. The need for content analysis of paradigms

I wish to stress the need for commutation-based scrutiny of both expression and content elements in what is traditionally recognized as paradigms. 'Squinting grammar' is far more widespread than it is normally thought.

Let us take case in Danish as an example, but note that the point applies to English as well. Tradition speaks of two cases in Danish nouns, the uninflected form vs. the genitive, and of three cases in a handful of Danish personal pronouns, the nominative, the accusative, and the genitive, as in:

(9) nom. hun 'she'
acc. hende 'her'
gen. hendes 'her'/'hers'

It treats this inventory list as a paradigm without explicitly stating the criteria. Such inventory lists are useful as a first step in organizing the material, but they do not per

se offer an exhaustive analysis of a paradigm.

As Hawkins (1986) and also Dahl and Bybee (1989) have noticed, the content of an expression-based paradigm may very well be heterogeneous. In such cases, one should look for the common denominators of content, not only for distributional similarities at the expression level. However, what could be the common denominator of content for this purported paradigm? The nominative marks subject function, the accusative occurs in all non-subject functions[2]. The genitive, however, does not define the function of noun phrases, but it converts them from NPs to predicatives and determiners. (Note that English has further differentiated the results of these two conversion processes: *hers* (predicative) vs. *her* (determiner)). So the Danish genitive is in opposition to non-genitive, thus forming a distinct paradigm, inflectional and syntactic at the same time.

Instead of the above list, the output of this analysis is two distinct paradigms. A shallow traditional case paradigm, distinguishing only nominative and accusative:

(10) nom. hun 'she'
acc. hende 'her'

And another paradigm concerning the category-shifting of arguments into determiners/predicatives:

(11) Argument:
non-gen. hun/hende 'she/her'
Determiner/predicative:
gen. hendes 'her/hers'

Notice that grammatical meaning is also content and that the genitive vs. non-genitive option is also a content option. What the genitive does is to instruct the receiver to interpret the noun/pronoun as a determiner.

The portmanteau structure of richer case systems in languages like Latin and

Old Scandinavian is not at variance with this view. In the classical languages and in Old Nordic as well, genitives had portmanteau structure. Genitives could be governed, as in Old Danish:

(12) a. bitha hans
wait he-GEN
'wait for him'

b. mista thæs
lose this-GEN
'lose this'

I shall assume that the case paradigm in such languages is constituted at the content level through its function of marking nominals for semantic roles and grammatical relations, and - incidentally - that a universal definition of case would involve these very same content notions. From this perspective, portmanteau structure consists in gluing additional, non-constitutive content functions onto core members of the case paradigm. The predicative and possessive uses of the genitive is one example, the final dative in Latin is another:

(13) a. auxilio esse
help-DAT be
'be of help'

b. usui esse
use-DAT be
'be of use'

This sketch of the content functions of universal case may very well be questionable. My point, however, is to draw out the consequences of my concept of the paradigm.

Since there is no longer a semantic common denominator for nominative, accusative and genitive in Danish pronouns, these three traditional case forms no longer constitute one paradigm, but fall into two distinct paradigms. For Danish (and English) I would prefer to speak of case only in the nominative vs. accusative-contrast, since this expresses grammatical relations and thus is closer to the universal definition. As a consequence, non-pronominal NPs in Danish do not inflect for case at all, but only for the non-genitive vs. genitive opposition, as in:

(14)	non-gen.	Peter	kvinde 'woman'
	gen.	Peter-s	kvinde-s 'woman's'

Thus neither in Danish nor in English is the genitive a member of the category of case. This line of thought is simple, but I have not come across it elsewhere. Hawkins (1986) sees the heterogeneity of the traditional case paradigm for English pronouns, but he does not draw the same conclusion as I do: that we are dealing with two distinct paradigms[3].

Thus my focus of attention is on the language specific content structure of paradigms: their content form. The implications of this view for the understanding of grammaticalization will be dealt with in the final section 9. First, I shall briefly discuss two examples of the confusion that may arise in approaches that do not distinguish language specific content form from content substance.

7. Functional explanations and content form

The point I wish to make has to do with the status of functional categories appealed to in a functional explanation. Faarlund (1990) presents a particularly interesting example of a functional explanation. The change in Proto-Nordic from SOV to SVO is related to cognitive assumptions about information structure. SVO structure (object last) assumed to be isomorphic to cognitively plausible information flows where the

rightmost part is the cognitively most salient part, SOV structure goes counter to the cognitive organization of messages and is therefore the vulnerable part, once rule competition between SVO and SOV begins.

Explanations along this line, however, are dubious. For one thing, of course, cognitive organization might just as well be claimed (as it is in fact by Givón) to run in the other direction: salient part first. But, more importantly, the issue of conventional semantic structure is not raised, and Faarlund never reflects on the possible distinction between message structure as a cognitive phenomenon and as a linguistic phenomenon. Grammaticalized information structure may very well be at variance with cognitive information structure as regards content, and most probably always is, to some degree. In Falster Jakobsen and Heltoft (this volume) it is argued that Danish SVO word order cannot be regarded as a simple expression of growing cognitive salience from left to right. An intermediate layer of linguistic content structure (content form) is indispensable. Where Runic Norse is concerned, Faarlund's hypothesis rests on the assumption that there is no such coding on the content level. Suppose, however, that Runic Norse had SOV order and that in such examples the grammaticalized information structure mechanisms allowed bracketing of the finite verb as non-focus, signalling that the focus falls on one or more of the preceding noun phrases. This hypothesis fits in neatly with a number of well-known data showing that the subject or subject appositions can constitute the focus (Moltke 1986):

(15)	*ek*	*hlewagastiz*	*holtijaz*	*horna*
	I-NOM	Lægæst-NOM	holt-SUFF-NOM	horn-ACC

tawido
make-PAST 1SG
'I Lægæst son of Holt made (this) horn'
(Gallehus golden horn)

(16) *hagiradaz* *tawide*
hagrad-NOM make-PAST 3SG
'Hagradr made (this box)'
(Stenmagle wooden box)

Here the objects are certainly non-focus, in Stenmagle even omitted, the verbs are probably non-focus, and the subjects certainly focus. It is hard to see why such a system should be more difficult to process than SVO structure. At any rate, the burden of proof lies on those who raise such claims; not that they could not turn out to be right, but any attempt at such a proof must account for the relationships between linguistically analyzable content structure (content form) and extralinguistically substantiated cognitive message structure.

The structuring of cognitive salience in human languages is not a straightforward, isomorphic matter, but one that calls for language-specific analyses of content and expression structure.

9. Synchronic and diachronic confusions in content analysis

Some theories of meaning view semantic change as expression change and grammatical reshuffling of content. In such theories, meaning lies solely on a level of cognitive and/or functional universals. This basic assumption underlies both logically inspired theories of meaning and functional theories based on assumptions of isomorphic relationships between linguistic expression and cognitive content (Givon 1990:893).

Within a functional theory, any grammar encompasses the relationship between language-specific semantic structure (content form) and expression form. From the present vantage point, then, purely universalist theories of meaning lead to possible confusions both in content analysis and in the identification of synchronic and diachronic facts.

Let us take localism in grammar as a theory (or rather, set of theories) which

is often unclear with respect to its status between abstract cognitive structure and language-specific structure ('form' in the continental European sense of that term).

There are two basic versions of localism. One is a universalist theory of cognitive organization, as in Lakoff and Johnson 1980 (Lakoff 1987 has strong elements of such a theory, and also John Lyons 1977:718-724 seems to subscribe to a version of it). The other version is a theory of language- specific semantic linguistic structure, containing for example the idea that Indo-European was a so-called active language based on the animate vs. inanimate distinction and had no transitive verbs, thus no verb 'have' and no genitive, but instead of these locative constructions or their equivalents. Compare the well-known Russian example:

(17) *u* *menja* *kniga*
with I-GEN book-NOM
'I have a book'

And the originally locative Latin dative in:

(18) *mihi* *est* *liber*
I-DAT is book-NOM
'I have a book'

More specifically, it has been argued by many linguists that Latin and the Romance languages are to a large extent localistic (e.g. Benveniste 1960, Lyons 1967, Herslund 1988). This is not the place to contest any particular analysis or theory of the localistic nature of language in general or of particular languages. What should be underlined, however, is the consequence of these assumptions for what counts as valid arguments.

Historical comparison does not in itself substantiate synchronic claims. The knowledge that in English the continuous tenses were in their origin locative prepositional phrase like (19), adapted from John Lyons (1977:719), is of course no argument for the conclusion that present day English progressives are local.

(19) *he was at courting Mary Jane > he was a-courting Mary Jane > he was courting Mary Jane*

A localistic theory, based on the principles advocated here, would make it clear whether it is a theory of synchronic reality, i.e. of sets of rules productive in the grammar of particular languages, or, alternatively, a theory of historical development, i.e. of extension of prototypically locative patterns to other semantic fields.

Secondly, it would specify - for a synchronic theory - in what respects localism refers to substance (i.e. the cognitively or philosophically necessary basis for a linguistic semantics), or to content form (i.e. language-specific semantic organization). At the expression level it would specify whether locative expressions are in fact expressions of locative content, or, alternatively, generalizations at the expression level concerning constructions with no recognizable locative content. A synchronic localistic theory must be substantiated on synchronic grounds. Either - at the content level - through applications of the commutation test or other relevant semantic tests, or, at the syntactic and lexical expression level, through the demonstration of feature clusters that are synchronically or diachronically relatable to locative meaning.

And thirdly, it would systematically apply the distinction between productive and non-productive rules and thus identify historical sediments still recognizable in the grammars of particular languages but no longer productive.

10. Grammaticalization - synchrony and diachrony

We cannot expect to understand a grammaticalization process unless we know both the system it took off from and the new system it was incorporated into. Any synchronic state of a language shows extensive sediments of non-productive rules and categories, and consequently, any grammar must treat them as such and distinguish them from productive components of the grammar. Such non-productive rules and categories are often the result of processes that convert and regrammaticalize part of a former category, leaving so to speak the remnants for petrification. This view is

parallel to C. Lehmann's (1993): At the structural level, a grammatical change can only be understood if seen both in terms of the input conditions (the system from which it departed) and the output (the system resulting). Both leave their mark on the result of the process.

A particularly interesting and intricate example is the fate in the modern Scandinavian languages (Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish, represented here mainly by Danish alone except where differences between them are at stake) of the so-called mediopassives in Old Norse (represented here by Old Icelandic/Old Norwegian). This category ending in *-mk/-sk* (later in *-st*, Danish and Swedish *-s*) derives from enclitic reflexive pronouns still morphologically recognizable in Old Icelandic. It had four semantic subcategories:

a. reflexives, e.g. *geymask* 'guard oneself', 'hide', *leggjask* 'lie down', *setjask* 'sit down', etc.
b. reciprocal forms *berjask* 'fight one another', *hittask* 'find one another, meet', *mætask* 'meet', etc.
c. intransitives *andask* 'die', *kennask* 'seem, appear', *lúkask* 'be shut, end', takask 'begin', *týnask* 'perish', etc.
d. passives *búask* 'be equipped', *synjask* 'be denied', etc.
(note that this passive coexisted with the periphrastic passive of proto-Germanic origin).

Dyvik (1980) suggests that the common content of the mediopassive is argument reduction from two semantic roles to one, but whatever the exact formulation of this core meaning, the point remains that they are one category with four contextually determined senses.

In modern Danish the mediopassive is no longer a single category: the reflexives have been restored to V + reflexive pronouns, a productive category now distinct from the rest of the former paradigm. In contrast to the old language, Modern Danish has *gemme sig* 'hide (oneself)', *vaske sig* 'wash oneself, wash' *lægge sig* 'lie down,

go to bed', *sætte sig* 'sit down', etc., but not the morphological successor of the reflexive **gemmes*, **vaskes*, **lægges*, **sættes* in the reflexive sense. Reflexives are now two-argument predicates.

The passive sense has been semantically reanalyzed with respect to their relationship to the periphrastic passive. Where Danish is concerned, the passives have established a 'new' category of mood within the passive system, retaining, however, the old expression system. We shall return to this shortly.

The two remaining senses of the original paradigm are now unproductive in modern Danish. The historical impact of these changes has resulted in large - though shrinking - classes of verba deponentia, with no active counterparts, semantically distinct from real passives but inflectionally identical. Danish has reciprocals such as *enes* 'agree', *mødes* 'meet (each other)', *skændes* 'quarrel', *slås* 'fight', and intransitives such as *dages* 'break (of the day), *grønnes* 'turn green', *slukkes* 'die out (of fire, light)', *ældes* 'grow old', and *ændres* 'change'. Modern loan words, however, are never allowed with this morphology and content. (Hopper and Traugott (1993) refer to parts of the regrammaticalization of the mediopassive, but miss the point that intransitive and reciprocal *s*-forms are unproductive: 'In Danish <this *-s*> has occasional passive uses (..), but its more usual function is to express middle <intransitive verb of consciousness quoted> and reciprocal <reciprocal example quoted>'. Kemmer (1993) gets the distinction between productive and unproductive patterns right).

Nowhere in the literature have the productive patterns been described adequately. For an attempt to improve this situation, see Falster Jakobsen and Heltoft (this volume).

11. Grammaticalization: generalization, reanalysis and content form

We have seen how inflectional reflexivization is lost in modern Danish as a productive pattern. This does not mean, however, that no productive parts remain from the original paradigm. The passive sense has been detached and reinterpreted in modern

Danish as part of an opposition of mood between the periphrastic passive and the s-passive. In simple declarative sentences the choice of the periphrastic passive results in speaker-oriented utterances in the sense that the propositional content of the utterance is regarded as part of the speaker's experience alone, often resulting in factual descriptions of simple facts, while the *s*-passive indicates the involvement of some consciousness other than the speaker's.

(20) a. *FIOLTEATRET* *LUKKES*
The Fiol Theatre close-PRES S-MOOD
'the Fiol Theatre is to be closed'

b. *FIOLTEATRET* BLIVER LUKKET
The Fiol Theatre become-PRES close-PAST PTC
'the Fiol Theatre will be closed'

(20a) is a newspaper headline in the s-mood of the passive paradigm, meaning that the utterance involves an intention outside the speaker: the closing of the theatre is somebody else's plan or reported from somebody else. (20b) places the intention solely with the speaker, meaning that the product is a simple declarative prediction, the future sense being the normal output of dynamic verbs of change in the present tense. The point here is that this opposition has to do with the question of whether the consciousness of other persons is involved or not. In this sense Falster-Jakobsen and I speak of the involvement of particular intentions, speaker and non-speaker.

Another frequent use of the *s*-mood of the passive is the generic or normative sense:

(21) a. *tales* *der* *dansk* *i Skåne?*
speak-PRES-S-MOOD there Danish in Scania?
'is Danish spoken in Scania?

b.	bliver	*der*	talt	*dansk i*
	become-PRES	there	speak-PAST PTC	Danish

i Skåne?
in Scania?'
'is Danish spoken in Scania?

Here (21a) is the normative reading, asking whether Danish is the linguistic norm in Scania, whereas (21b) is the simple descriptive reading, asking whether it occurs that Danish is spoken there. Most significantly, the *s*-mood cannot be used in describing simple factual events, since such simple constatives are only related to the speaker.

To determine just how old this reinterpretation of the *s*-passive is remains a problem for extensive empirical investigation, but the structural analysis as hinted at here sets the scene for a hypothesis about the chains of grammaticalization involved in the transition from a voice system to a kind of mood system. The probable outset is a reading of the passive with a general and therefore very often deleted agent. Such general readings are readily interpreted as normative. Normative readings involve generally accepted knowledge, and therefore speaker-external consciousness; the speaker-external consciousness of normative readings is again generalizable to consciousness and intentions in general, including that of particular non-speakers.

PASSIVE > GENERAL PASSIVE > NORMATIVE > PARTICULAR NON-SPEAKER CONSCIOUSNESS

This process, as stated here, involves only generalization. Arriving at the modern Danish state involves reanalysis as well, including everything that can be regarded as norm and intention and excluding the simple passive reading, which is then left with the periphrastic form alone.

GENERAL PASSIVE > NORMATIVE > PARTICULAR NON-SPEAKER CONSCIOUSNESS

Strikingly, generalization alone accounts for the situation in modern Swedish where the *s*-passive retains its purely descriptive function, while generalizing also to the normative and intentional uses. Danish, however, adds a reanalysis to the non-descriptive modal senses alone. Thus, Swedish allows simple descriptives as in:

(22) Hampus Broberg och Helena Hansson häktades
Hampus Broberg and Helena Hansson arrest-PAST S-PASSIVE

<..> fem minutter över tio nästa morgon
five minutes past ten the next morning
'Hampus Broberg and Helena Hansson were arrested five minutes past ten the next morning'

A Danish translation would by contrast have to use the periphrastic passive:

(23) Hampus Broberg og Helena Hansson blev
Hampus Broberg og Helena Hansson become-PAST

anholdt <..> fem...
arrest-PAST PTC five...

Similarly, in (24) Swedish can use the *s*-passive to describe a single factual event, while the Danish translation must be in the periphrastic mood:

Swedish:

(24) Ryska ubåten hittades på
The Russian submarine find-PAST S-PASSIVE on

ett skär utan för Karlskrona
a rock off Karlskrona

'The Russian submarine was found on a rock off Karlskrona'

Danish:

(25) Den russiske ubåd blev fundet på
The Russian submarine becom-PAST find-PAST PTC on

et skær ud for Karlskrona
a rock off Karlskrona
'The Russian submarine was found on a rock off Karlskrona'

In technical terms, the Swedish s-passive is a zero category in Hjelmslev's sense (Hjelmslev 1935:100). In this sense I shall speak of the zero category as the unmarked term of the opposition, the periphrastic passive as the marked term. The zero term can have all the functions of the marked term, but not vice versa.

In Danish, however, the general pattern is one of mutually exclusive terms, contrasting a Hjelmslevian +term and a -term.

It should be stressed again that these oppositions in Danish and Swedish represent the fully productive parts of the system, not non-productive remnants. What is particularly interesting about the Danish development is that the reanalysis as sketched can only be understood as a systematic reanalysis. It cuts off from the *s*-passive exactly the reading that does not fit with non-speaker consciousness, and the motivation for this reanalysis lies in the fact that what was cut off from the *s*-passive was readily expressible in the periphrastic passive. The reanalysis leads to a system with clear boundaries, marked at the expression level by inflection and periphrasis, and at the content level by an exclusive opposition between elements of content structure (content form) specifying the consciousness involved as either solely with the speaker (subjectivity) or as involving other, non-speaker consciousness (non-subjectivity).

12. Conclusion

We have followed the history of the original mediopassive at some length. This example illustrates my view of the structure-boundedness of grammaticalization processes and furthermore, of the dynamic character of any socalled synchronic state of a language (cf. Heine and Traugott 1991). My view of the content structure of paradigms and the importance ascribed to that level of analysis has led to a structural, content-based view of grammaticality and of grammaticalization processes. On the basis of a revised concept of the paradigm, I have explicitly included semantically significant word order phenomena into grammar in the narrow sense, hence many types of word order change have also been viewed as grammaticalization processes. From this it followed that a spiral model of grammaticalization should replace the unidirectional model.

Grammaticalization processes are thus reorganizations of the expression-content relationship in specific languages. As far as the subcomponents of grammaticalization processes are concerned, generalization leads of course to relatively unmarked (polysemous) morphemes or constructions, but reanalysis establishes new, marked and less polysemous systems.

Notes:

1.I am grateful to Elisabeth Engberg-Pedersen, Peter Harder and Lisbeth Falster Jakobsen for extensive constructive criticism on earlier versions of this text. I have followed a large number of their suggestions. Also thanks to Erik Hansen (Copenhagen) and Carol Henriksen (Roskilde) for their comments.

2. The accusative can even occur as the case of the subject in complex subject nominals, especially in the spoken or informal language:

(1)	Hende	og	Peter er enige	i denne sag
	She-ACC.	and	Peter agree	in this issue
	'Her and Peter agree on this issue'			

But at any rate the opposition nom. vs. acc. has to do with the identification of the subject vs. the non-subject.

3.The present author - who recognizes zero-options at the expression level - would see no difficulty in pressing the point one step further by disentangling these two paradigms also at the expression level: *-s* vs. zero for the genitive vs. non-genitive, and *han* vs. *ham* for the nominative vs. accusative. Postulation of zeros would be allowed only in cases where the content paradigm had already been established. This would turn the strategy into a sort of paradigm-cracker, i.e. a tool for the reanalysis of traditional paradigms. The line of argument pursued in the rest of this article does not, however, presuppose this view.

References:

Benveniste, Émile 1960. 'Être' et 'avoir' dans leurs fonctions linguistiques. In Benveniste 1966.

Benveniste, Émile 1966. *Problèmes de Linguistique Générale.* Paris: Gallimard.

Bjerrum, Anders 1966. *Grammatik over Skånske Lov [Grammar of the Scanian Law].* København: Københavns Universitets fond til tilvejebringelse af læremidler.

Butler, Christopher S. 1988. Pragmatics and Systemic Linguistics. *Journal of Pragmatics 12,* 83-102.

Bybee, Joan L. 1985. *Morphology. A Study of the Relation between Meaning and Form.* Typological Studies in Language 9. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bybee, Joan L. and Östen Dahl 1989. The creation of tense and aspect systems in the languages of the world. *Studies in Language* 13, p. 51-103.

Bybee, Joan L. and William Pagliuca 1985. Cross-linguistic Comparison and the Development of Grammatical Meaning. In Jacek Fisiak (ed.), *Historical Semantics and Historical Word Formation.* Berlin: De Gruyter, p. 59-83.

Bybee, Joan L., Revere Perkins and William Pagliuca 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Comrie, Bernard 1981. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Dyvik, Helge 1980. Har gammelnorsk passiv? In Even Hovdhaugen (ed.), *The Nordic Languages and Modern Linguistics. Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference of Nordic and General Linguistics in Oslo 1980.* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Dyvik, Helge 1986. *Grammatik og empiri. En syntaktisk modell og dens forutsetninger, bd. 1-2.* Skriftserie fra Institutt for fonetikk og lingvistikk, Universitetet i Bergen, Serie B, nr. 25. Bergen.

Eisenberg, Peter 1989. *Grundriss der deutschen Grammatik.* Stuttgart: Metzler.

Faarlund, Jan Terje 1990. *Syntactic Change. Toward a Theory of Historical Syntax.* Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 50. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Givón, Talmy 1984-1990. *Syntax I-II.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Haberland, Hartmut and Lars Heltoft 1992. Universals, Explanations and Pragmatics. In Michel Kefer and Johan van der Auwera (eds.), *Grammar and Meaning - Cross Linguistic Perspectives.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 17-26.

Halliday, Michael 1985. An Introduction to Functional Grammar. London: Edward Arnold.

Hawkins, John L. 1986. *A Comparative Typology of English and German. Unifying the Contrasts.* London and Sydney: Croom Helm.

Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi and Friederike Hünnemeyer 1991. *Grammaticalization. A Conceptual Framework.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Heltoft, Lars 1992. The Topology of Verb Second and SVO-languages - a Study in the Sign Functions of Word Order. In Michael Herslund (ed.), *Copenhagen Studies in Language 15.* København: Munksgaard, p. 13-64.

Heltoft, Lars 1994. *S*-modus og perifrastisk modus i dansk. In *Språkbruk, grammatik och språkförandring. En festskrift till Ulf Teleman 13.1. 1994.* Institutionen för Nordiska Språk, Lunds Universitet.

Herslund, Michael 1988. *Le Datif en Français.* Bibliothèque de l'Information grammaticale 14. Louvain-Paris: Éditions Peeters.

Hjelmslev, Louis 1935. La Catégorie des Cas I. Étude de grammaire générale. *Acta Jutlandica VIII*, Århus: Universitetsforlaget i Aarhus.

Hopper, Paul J. and Elizabeth Closs Traugott 1993. *Grammaticalization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jakobsen, Lisbeth Falster og Lars Heltoft 1995. A Content Analysis of Morphological and Topological Mood in Danish. *This Volume.*

Kemmer, Suzanne 1993. *The Middle Voice.* Typological Studies in Language 23. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kurylowicz, Jerzy 1965. The Evolution of Grammatical Categories. *Esquisses Linguistiques 2*, p. 38-54.

Lehmann, Christian 1985. Grammaticalization: Synchronic Variation and Diachronic Change. *Lingua e Stile 20*, p. 303-18.

Lehmann, Christian 1992. Word Order Change by Grammaticalization. In Marinel Gerritsen and Dieter Stein (eds.), *Internal and External Factors in Syntactic Change*. Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 61. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 395-416.

Lehmann, Christian 1993. Theoretical Implications of Grammaticalization Phenomena. In William A. Foley (ed.), *The Role of Theory in Language Description*. Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 69. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 315-340.

Lehmann, W.P. 1976. From Topic to Subject in Indo-European. In Charles N. Li (ed.), p. 446-456.

Li, Charles N. 1976. *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press.

Li, Charles N. and Sandra A. Thompson 1976. Subject and Topic. A New Typology of Language. In Charles N. Li (ed.), p. 457-490.

Lyons, John 1967. A Note on Possessive, Existential and Locative Sentences. *Foundations of Language 4*.

Lyons, John 1997. *Semantics I-II*. Cambridge 1977.

Meillet, A. 1921 [1912]. L'Évolution des formes grammaticales. In A. Meillet, *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*. Paris: Edouard Champion, p. 130-148. Orig. in *Scientia (Rivista di Scienza), vol. XII, 1912, No. XXVI, 6.*

Moltke, Erik 1986. *The Runes and their Origin. Denmark and elsewhere*. Copenhagen: The National Museum of Denmark.

Rosén, Victoria 1991. Empty Pronouns and Topic Prominence in Old Norse and Vietnamese. I Halldór Sigurðsson, Þórsteinn Indriðason and Eiríkur Rögnvaldsson (ed.), *Papers From the Twelfth Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics. Reykjavík, June 14-16, 1990*. Reykjavík: Linguistic Institute, University of Iceland.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. and Bernd Heine 1991. Introduction. In Traugott, Elizabeth C. and Bernd Heine (eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization I-II.* Typological Studies in Language 19. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, p. 1-14.

ROLIG-papirer

1974

* 1. Utz Maas, Sprachtheorie
* 2. Per Aage Brandt, Om sprogets samfundsmæssighed
* 3. Lis Glebe-Møller, Ansatser til et opgør med den behavioristiske sprogundervisning

1975

* 4. Peter Harms Larsen, Papirer til «Samtalens grammatik»
* 5. Lis-Glebe-Møller, Hvilken slags fransk skal der undervises i i vore skoler?
Henning Silberbrandt, Fremmedsprogsindlæring og fagstruktur

1976

* 6. Frans Gregersen m.fl., Revideret udgave af introduktionen og kapitelindledningerne til antologien «Klassesprog»
* 7. Ulf Teleman, How to become concrete in linguistics

1977

* 8. Ulf Teleman, (1) On causal conjunctions in Swedish, (2) Språk och socialisiation, Reflexioner över reflexioner, (3) Grammatikens tillstånd och behov
* 9. Hartmut Haberland, Review of Bente Maegaard m.fl., Matematik og lingvistik
* 10. Andrew Tolson, Approaches to language in cultural studies
Ulrich Ammon, Probleme soziolinguistischer Theoriebildung am Beispiel von Dialekt und Einheitssprache

1978

* 11. Ulf Teleman, Språkrigtighet i och utanför skolan
* 12. Norbert Dittmar, Hartmut Haberland, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Ulf Teleman (eds.), Papers from the first Scandinavian-German symposium on the language of immigrant workers and their children, Roskilde 19–23 March 1978
* 13. Peter Harms Larsen, Tekst og tale – analyser og problemer
* 14. Niels Haastrup og Ulf Teleman, Svensk, dansk eller skandinavisk? En interview-undersøgelse af svenske læreres sproglige situation på et dansk universitet
15. Karen Risager (red.), Fremmedsprogsundervisning på RUC

1979

* 16. Karen Risager og Niels Haastrup (red.), Om anvendelse af sprogvidenskabelig viden i erhvervsfunktioner uden for skolesystemet. Rapport fra den 4. konference i nydansk grammatik og sprogbeskrivelse
* 17. Hartmut Haberland and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Political determinants of pragmatic and sociolinguistic choices

1980

* 18. Hverdagsskrift i anledning af ROLIGS femårsjubilæum
* 19. Elisabeth Bense, Linguistische Theorie und Sprachunterricht
Hartmut Haberland, Status und Legitimation von Theorien der Sprachvariation
* 20. Jørgen U. Sand og Søren Kolstrup, «Il fait rien? Je crois pas que je le dirais.»
* 21. Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, (1) Guest worker or immigrant — different ways of reproducing an underclass, (2) Violence as method and outcome in the non-education of minority children

1981

22. Karen Sonne Jakobsen, (1) Gruppeorganiseret og selvstyret fremmedsprogstilegnelse.

Et undervisningseksperiment på RUC. (2) Skolesprogene. Om fremmedsprogenes status og funktion i gymnasiet

* 23. Ulf Teleman, Talet och skriften

* 24. Arne Thing Mortensen, Jørgen U. Sand og Ulf Teleman, Om at læse fremmedsprogede tekster på 1. del af universitetsstudierne. 15 beskrevne og kommenterede forsøg.

* 25. Niels Haastrup, Ferie i udlandet & Færdighed i fremmedsprog. Rapportering om bearbejdelse af to statistiske undersøgelser

* 26. Karen Risager og Ulf Teleman (red.), Kønsspecifik sprogbrug — hvad er det?

1983

* 27. Niels Haastrup, Tre debatoplæg om sprogpolitik og sprogundervisning i Danmark

* 28. Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Cultilingualism - Papers in cultural and communicative (in)competence

29. Knud Anker Jensen, Kontrastiv hverdag. Et alternativt "Landeskunde"-seminar
Niels Haastrup, Fremmedsprog i det sprogsociologiske billede i Danmark

1984

30. Jochen Rehbein, Reparative Handlungsmuster und ihre Verwendung im Fremdsprachenunterricht

31. Hartmut Haberland og Jacob L. Mey, Godt Peer Gynt er halve verket
Hartmut Haberland, A field manual for readers of "The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages" by Bronislaw Malinowski

* 32. Annette Bennicke, «Dieu a créé la femelle, l'homme a fait la femme.» En rekognoscering i dansk og udenlandsk kønssprogsforskning

* 33. Lars Heltoft og Uwe Geist, Relevans og intention. To analyser af en massemedietekst om økonomisk politik

34. Niels Haastrup, Uddrag af Christian Jensen Fauerbyes papirer samt bilag. Handout fra Själö-symposiet, september 1984

1985

* 35. Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson, Educational strategies in multicultural contexts

36. Senta Trömel-Plötz, Women's conversational culture: Rupturing patriarchal discourse

37. Rainer Paris, Zur symbolischen Konstruktion politischer Feindbilder

38. Karen Sonne Jakobsen (red.), Projektarbejde i fremmedsprogene. Rapport fra seminar på Roskilde Universitetscenter, 30.11.-1.12.1985

1986

39. Lars Heltoft, Verb-second-analysen - et svar fra Diderichsen-traditionen

40. Lars Heltoft, The pragmatic syntax of Danish *der*-constructions

1987

41. Karen Risager, Cultural studies and foreign language teaching in Denmark.

1988

42. Robert Phillipson and Karen Sonne Jakobsen, eds., Student foreign language projects at RUC

* 43. Elisabeth Bense, Tyskland - et gråt land med et grimt sprog, oder: Die Haltung dänischer Gymnasiasten zu Deutsch, Deutschland und den Deutschen

1989

44. Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson, Wanted! Linguistic human rights

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

45. Karen Risager, Kulturformidlingen i fremmedsprogsundervisningen: 4 artikler.

1990

46. Carol Henriksen, Two papers on `fag(sprog)lig kommunikation'

1991

47. Jytte Becker, Samtaler i hvid kittel. En analyse af indlæggelsessamtaler og deres institutionelle betingelser

* 48. Hans-Georg Grüning, Minderheiten und Minderheitenliteratur — Beispiel: Südtirol
Mart Rannut, Beyond language policy: The Soviet Union versus Estonia

1992

49. Thorstein Fretheim, Grammatically underdetermined Theme-Rheme articulation

1993

50. Bent Preisler, Attitudes, norms and standardization in English: Some aspects of the language in its social context
Claudia Caffi, Metapragmatics and Chauncey Gardener: Toward an ecology of communication

51. Jens Høyrup, Sumerian: the descendant of a proto-historical creole? An alternative approach to the »Sumerian problem«

1994

52. Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, eds. Papers from the Round Table on Language Policy in Europe, Roskilde, April 22, 1994

1995

53. Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Papers in European language policy

54. Lars Heltoft and Lisbeth Falster Jakobsen, Danish passives and subject positions as a mood system – a content analysis
Lars Heltoft, Paradigmatic structure, word order and grammaticalization

* = udsolgt/out of print

BEST COPY AVAILABLE